

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, after 20 years, the United States is winding down its involvement in a long, protracted war in Afghanistan, but we have an obligation to the men and women who have served with Allied forces who put themselves at risk, especially the interpreters.

I am proud of the fact that the first 2,500 of those people will be, in fact, located in Virginia for processing as we try to protect them and their families for their service in a noble cause.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to voting for the bill that will be coming up later this morning, and I thank Mr. CROW, particularly, for his leadership in this matter.

#### INCREASING INFLATION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see President Biden has acknowledged that we are having a lot of inflation right now in this country affecting prices for everybody. He even went so far as to tell some restaurant owners that you are going to be in a bind for a while because it is going to still be hard to get workers.

When people are paid not to show up because of overgenerous benefits, all our small businesses will continue to be in a bind. When you pay people not to work, you get inflation. So for a few maybe getting a wage increase because the restaurants are in a bind, everybody receives higher prices. Prices are up, we know, on food, on fuel, lumber, many things. This is what happens when the government spends too much, puts too much money into the economy all based on debt.

So what are we going to do about that? Are we going to set a course here to put people back in business, or do we want to have, like we saw just this last month, another 5.4 percent of inflation, which is really a tax on every American.

#### AVERTING LOSS OF LIFE AND INJURY BY EXPEDITING SIVS ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 535, I call up the bill (H.R. 3985) to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to expedite the special immigrant visa process for certain Afghan allies, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN). Pursuant to House Resolution 535, the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117-95, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3985

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021” or as the “ALLIES Act of 2021”.

#### SEC. 2. IMPROVING AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

(a) EVIDENCE OF SERIOUS THREAT.—Section 602(b)(2) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking “has experienced or is experiencing” and inserting “has asserted a credible basis for concern about the possibility of”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (E).

(b) ACTIVITIES FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED WITH INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE OF SUCCESSOR FORCE.—Section 602(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I)(bb) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by striking “sensitive and trusted”.

(c) AFGHANS EMPLOYED SUBJECT TO A GRANT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Section 602(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by inserting after “United States Government” the following “, including employment or other work in Afghanistan through a cooperative agreement or grant funded by the United States Government if the Secretary of State determines, based on a recommendation from the Federal agency or organization authorizing such funding, that such alien contributed to the United States mission in Afghanistan”.

(d) ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security” and inserting “the Secretary of State”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “a petition for classification under section 203(b)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4))” and inserting “a request for such status in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “petition” and inserting “request”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)(i) by striking “petition” and inserting “request”.

(e) STRENGTHENING PROTECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—Subparagraph (C) of section 602(b)(2) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) SURVIVING SPOUSE OR CHILD.—An alien is described in this subparagraph if—

“(i) the alien was the spouse or child of a principal alien described in subparagraph (A) who had submitted a request for classification pursuant to this section or a petition pursuant to section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 8 U.S.C. 1101 note) which included the alien as an accompanying spouse or child; and

“(ii) such request or petition—

“(I) if approved, was revoked (or otherwise rendered null) due to the death of the principal alien; or

(II) if pending, is otherwise approvable but for the death of the principal alien.”.

(f) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any requests for special immigration status, applications for special immigrant visas, or applications for adjustment of status under the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) that are pending on

the date of the enactment of this Act or filed on or after such date.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by this section shall not diminish, replace or override any vetting, verification of employment, approval by chief of mission, or any other screening process required for a special immigrant visa under the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note).

#### SEC. 3. AFGHAN ALLIES PROTECTION ACT.

Section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, in addition to any unused balance under this paragraph, 8,000 principal aliens may be granted special immigrant status under this subsection. For purposes of status provided under this subparagraph the authority to issue visas or adjust status shall commence on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and shall terminate on the date such visa numbers are exhausted.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3985.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3985, the Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021, or the ALLIES Act, makes essential changes to the Afghan special immigrant visa program to ensure that the lives of those who served faithfully alongside American troops in Afghanistan are protected.

The special immigrant visa program allows those individuals who worked for or on behalf of the U.S. Government in Afghanistan, or for the NATO International Security Assistance Force in support of the American mission, to seek lawful permanent residence in the United States.

To be eligible, applicants must establish qualifying employment in Afghanistan for 2 years, receive approval from the Chief of Mission, and undergo rigorous background checks and national security vetting, a process that, on average, takes 3 years.

Our 20-year mission in Afghanistan will formally come to an end in just a few short weeks. Each day that we continue to draw down our military presence in Afghanistan, threats to the lives of Afghans who supported our cause are increasing exponentially.

The Biden administration has committed to relocating certain applicants

to a third country. Some who have passed the national security vetting process will be transferred to the United States to complete visa processing.

These evacuations, which are scheduled to begin at the end of this month, are a critical component of our withdrawal strategy. But evacuations alone are not enough. Congress must do our part to protect those whose lives are at risk because of their support and service to our Nation.

First and foremost, we must ensure that enough visas are available for eligible applicants. H.R. 3985 increases the number of visas that may be issued to qualifying Afghans by 8,000, which would ensure that all qualified applicants who are currently undergoing processing can immediately receive a visa if they are approved.

Second, we must streamline visa processing to the greatest extent possible, without compromising national security or program integrity.

H.R. 3985 does this by reducing duplicative paperwork requirements and modifying the requirement that applicants prove the existence of an ongoing serious threat to their lives; to reflect the fact that Afghans who worked in support of the U.S. mission now face an obvious threat as a direct result of their work.

Third, the bill strengthens protections for certain groups of Afghan nationals, including surviving spouses, and children of deceased principal applicants, individuals employed by NATO in support of the U.S. mission, and individuals whose work was funded by a U.S. Government cooperative agreement or grant.

Collectively, these changes will ensure that no one whose lives are at risk because of their support to the American mission are abandoned or forced to wait for Congress to act to authorize more visas.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of this important bill. I thank Representative CROW for championing the cause of our Afghan allies and working across the aisle to build consensus and support for this legislation. We must keep our promises to these brave men and women. Their lives depend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3985, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the culmination of 20 years of policy failures in Afghanistan, and it comes at the same time that our southern border has been recklessly opened to the world. This measure's only redeeming feature is that the alternative is even worse.

Let's begin with the debacle occurring on what, until January 20, was our southern border; finally secured by President Trump's policies.

On his first day in office, President Biden reversed those policies. He stopped the "remain in Mexico" proto-

cols that required asylum claimants to remain there while their claims could be adjudicated. He stopped all construction on the nearly completed border wall, leaving construction gaps that make it all but useless. And he ordered our enforcement agencies not to faithfully execute the law.

The result is that over a million foreign nationals have illegally entered our country this year, with a projection of 2 million by the end of the year. Now, that is the entire population of Wyoming, Alaska, and Vermont combined. And the Gallup organization warns that based on its polling, there are 42 million people just in Latin America and the Caribbean who intend to follow. And this occurs at the same time that 20 years of failed policy in Afghanistan is culminating.

The attack on September 11, 2001, was our generation's Pearl Harbor. It was conducted by al-Qaida, which was acting as an agency of the Taliban government of Afghanistan, which gave it support and protection.

Now, the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress pledged the entire resources of the country to the war and the President pledged to win through to "absolute victory." Days after the attack on New York and Washington on September 11, Congress voted a tepid Authorization for the Use of Military Force—whatever that is—and the President told us to go shopping.

For 20 years, we dithered, twiddled, postured, hesitated. We attacked Iraq, that had nothing to do with 9/11, and put a lot of brave troops in harm's way without giving them the support that they needed and without our leaders ever having a clear objective, much less any will to win.

You know, it was from that very podium in this Chamber that General Douglas MacArthur warned that in war there is no substitute for victory. That is a lesson our leaders have failed to learn time and again. So this debacle is now coming to its sad, shameful, and sorry conclusion.

The Taliban again threatened to seize this ill-fated country, imperiling the thousands of Afghans who assisted our troops in various ways. To encourage their help, we passed the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009, which created a special immigrant visa, or green card program, for Afghan nationals who worked with the United States Government for at least a year, and who face retribution from the Taliban. This program also provides green cards to their spouses and their children.

Now, during the 20 years that our troops have been in Afghanistan, tens of thousands of Afghans have worked for or on behalf of the U.S. Government in one capacity or another, and to date, over 15,500 green cards have already been issued to the principal applicants. And then additionally, for each principal applicant, an average of 3.5 green cards have been issued to spouses and children. That is about 70,000 that we

have already taken in. That is a city the size of Bowling Green, Kentucky. But many more are still there.

So we have before us H.R. 3985, the ALLIES Act. It makes changes to the Afghan special immigrant visa program to accommodate the accelerated withdrawal that the President has ordered.

The emergency created by this order means that we will not be adequately vetting arrivals under this program. Those already admitted have had to meet eligibility requirements. They have had to undergo security and background checks. If we had been able to develop this legislation the old-fashioned way, through real face-to-face meetings and good-faith discussions, I think we could have produced a process that protected both the American people and the Afghan families who sided with our government. But alas, that was not to be under this majority.

Instead, H.R. 3985 authorizes 8,000 more green cards on top of the 10,000 authorized but still unclaimed. Now, given that 15,500 principal green cards have been processed over the 20-year life of this program, the odds of processing a like number in a matter of months is pretty slim; unless, of course, the administration cuts processing and vetting corners, which I think is a given.

H.R. 3985 also increases the eligibility pool for the Afghan special immigration visa program in two ways.

First, it removes the requirement that Afghan nationals who worked with the U.S. coalition forces must have performed "sensitive and trusted" activities for U.S. personnel. This provision was added several years ago with the understanding that there must be limits on the number of people who come to the U.S., and in an attempt to ensure that the limited number of green cards available actually go to those Afghan nationals who are most in danger.

Now, we have asked the administration how many individuals may be eligible once this language is removed from the statute. Their answer? They don't know. And they don't care.

Second, this bill extends program eligibility to Afghans whose employers received grant funding from the U.S. Government or were in cooperative agreements with the U.S. Government and who "contributed to the United States mission in Afghanistan."

Well, I am concerned that we do not know exactly what can be considered as contributing to the United States mission in Afghanistan or how many people to whom this could apply.

The bill also eliminates the requirement that an applicant has experienced an ongoing, serious threat as a consequence of his or her qualifying employment. This requirement is one of the main reasons for the creation of the program; to help ensure the safety of those in danger because of working with the U.S.

This means that among the worthy asylum seekers, we are likely to see

those without merit, or worse, those who seek to do our country harm, because the vetting process is effectively abandoned by this bill. And this comes at a time when the asylum process is being made a mockery by thousands of meritless claims a day showing up on our southern border and being admitted into our country.

I wish we could have had an honest and open discussion about the wisdom of eliminating this requirement in committee. Unfortunately, the Democrats chose to bypass the committee process. But with the American withdrawal fast approaching, we are left with this deeply flawed bill on the one hand, or the very real prospect of watching Afghan patriots being hunted down and seeing them and their families hung by construction cranes. So I will support this bill as the least bad option that the Democrats have left us.

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

□ 0930

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, the ALLIES Act is a chance for Congress to ensure that America honors its promise to our Afghan partners and friends.

The phrase "life and death" gets tossed around in this Chamber, but this bill is truly that for thousands of our Afghan friends. The Taliban is intent on hunting down and killing Afghans that served alongside Americans for the past 20 years.

Some Members of this body, including me, may not be here today without the service and sacrifice of Afghans who answered the call to serve shoulder to shoulder with us. Those Afghans knew the risk that their service posed to them and their families, yet they signed up to help because they believed we would have their back.

They have already demonstrated unwavering courage and loyalty by working alongside us. They have demonstrated their commitment to America, and they have earned a path to safety.

The U.S. combat mission in Afghanistan will come to an end in a matter of weeks. At the same time, the threat to our Afghan partners who served alongside men and women is increasing drastically every single day.

Simply put, we are running out of time. They are running out of time. We must streamline the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa process and increase the number of visas to match the pipeline of applicants. The ALLIES Act does just that.

The ALLIES Act removes several administrative barriers to expedite visa processing, and it makes these changes without weakening the important security vetting of applicants. The bill allows family members of deceased SIV applicants to continue through the process if the applicant is killed before visa approval.

The bill clarifies that Afghans who worked to benefit the U.S. mission under federally funded cooperative agreements and grants also qualify for the program. This includes Afghans who performed critical democracy, human rights, and governance work on behalf of the U.S.

Lastly, the ALLIES Act raises the visa cap by 8,000 visas to meet the current number of applicants.

Before I close, let me thank the Honoring Our Promises Working Group, a bipartisan group; the Biden administration; Leader HOYER; and the Judiciary Committee for their partnership in crafting this bill and getting us to the vote today.

This is personal to any of us who served with the men and women who will be saved by this bill. But it is also a moral and national security issue for America.

It is a moral issue because the American handshake must matter. We must be a country that honors our promises if we are to be a beacon of hope and democracy for the world.

It is a national security issue because America is strong, not just because we have aircraft carriers and fighters and bombers, but because we have friends and allies. We don't go it alone. We face many threats, and we will continue to in the future, and we will need friends to help us face those threats. If we turn our back on the Afghans who served with us for the last two decades, it is going to be awfully hard to find future friends.

Mr. Speaker, this is our chance to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the ALLIES Act.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a veteran of the Afghanistan war.

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, for me, as well, this is a very personal endeavor and a very personal bill.

Speaking as a combat veteran of the Afghan war, the Afghans supporting our troops weren't just interpreters; they became our brothers and our sisters on the battlefield. We depended on each other for survival.

They fought with us; they bled with us; and in many cases, they died with us, all for the dream of a better Afghanistan, for a safer world, for prosperity for their families, and for ripping out the dangerous and sick extremist ideology that has tormented their country, taken their society backward, and threatened the United States of America.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration's reckless withdrawal is allowing the Taliban to once again seize control of Afghanistan.

The urgency of the situation on the ground is not hyperbole. Just yesterday, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said the Taliban appears to have strategic momentum in their offensive, and I hope that this Congress can continue supporting the Afghan security forces to help them halt that advance and, in

the wake of it, al-Qaida's and ISIS' inevitable rise.

No one is safe from the Taliban reprisal. We have seen in recent weeks the mass execution of surrendering Afghan security forces and the Afghan interpreters who worked with our troops that are now at the top of the Taliban's target list.

The United States made a commitment to our allies in this conflict, and these individuals have lived up to their end of the bargain. Now, we have an obligation to honor our promises to them.

According to the State Department, the average processing time for an SIV applicant is over 700 days. This is unacceptable, given the urgency.

I want to be clear. The legislation before us, which I strongly support, does not diminish or circumvent the screening process. Trust me, before these men and women were allowed to work with our units, they were heavily vetted, and that is before this 700-day process that they are now going through.

I support increasing the number of Special Immigrant Visas by 8,000. I support streamlining this process. And if it comes to it, I support taking care of the families of those who didn't make it back, like one of my interpreters, who we called Spartacus, who was found with American documentation on him and taken back to his village and beheaded along with members of his family to send a message.

It is notable, Mr. Speaker, that, in 1975, then-Senator Biden did not support the evacuation of our South Vietnamese allies. I hope now-President Biden will erase that sin.

It is not just a moral obligation. It is a national security obligation because when our soldiers have to go back to deal with a rising al-Qaida, which I sadly predict they will have to, we will need local allies once again.

We are sending a message right now by our conduct. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation and ask the Senate to swiftly pass it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 23 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 19½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. As has been mentioned, it makes key changes in the Afghan Allies Protection Act to ensure that the Special Immigrant Visa program, which is part of current law, works as Congress intended to protect the lives of Afghan nationals who served honorably alongside U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

For the past several years, many of us have expressed grave concerns about the challenges our allies face in navigating the Special Immigrant Visa process. It currently takes an average

of 3 years to complete the process, which includes numerous forms, applications, detailed documentary requirements, and lengthy criminal background and national security checks.

This bill makes important changes to streamline the application without compromising the national security interests or the integrity of the program.

Now, I think back to when we voted after 9/11, and I don't think any of us—and I will speak for myself—believed that we were starting a 20-year war, the longest war in America's history. During that war, Afghans stepped forward to serve beside our brave military.

I am proud that veterans in this Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, have stepped forward to work together to make sure that this bill moves forward so that we can honor our commitment.

Mr. Speaker, we are finally leaving Afghanistan after 20 years, our longest war. We have a moral obligation to ensure that our allies can safely and more quickly be removed from harm, so we need to stand by these brave men and women and pass this bill. It is in the national interest.

If we can't keep our promises to our allies, who is going to believe us in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CROW from Colorado, in particular, for leading on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3985, the ALLIES Act.

For almost two decades, American troops have fought the war on terror in Afghanistan. Over the course of the war, thousands of native Afghans put their lives on the line to support our American servicemembers. They served as translators, guides, contractors, and more. Their support was critical to the safety of our servicemembers and the success of our operations.

They showed true bravery and risked their lives in pursuit of an end to the Taliban's regime and a free nation. Now, their decision to help Americans is seen as traitorous by the Taliban, and many of these Afghans and their families have been marked for death.

This danger has only been compounded by the Biden administration's hasty withdrawal from Afghanistan. No plans were originally put in place to help these individuals evacuate, and now, many face dire consequences.

We have a moral imperative to support those who served alongside our men and women in uniform and cannot leave them behind. While the administration has announced plans to evacuate some of our Afghan allies, they should not have been an afterthought.

I call on the administration to expeditiously process SIV applicants and expand their efforts to get these individuals and their families out of harm's way immediately.

In addition to those efforts, I am pleased the House is considering this critical legislation today. It expands and amends the Special Immigrant Visa program to better support our Afghan allies and their families. These combined actions are the least we can do to help them for their service to us.

Anyone who puts their life on the line to stand alongside American servicemembers deserves not only our gratitude, but they deserve our protection. That is why I am proud to vote in favor of the ALLIES Act of 2021, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3985, the ALLIES Act of 2021.

First, I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward, and I thank my friend, Mr. CROW, for sponsoring this bill.

Recently, I met with Combined Arms, a local organization that works with veterans and SIV recipients in Houston. They shared their harrowing stories of the sacrifices they and their families have made and of their fear that they have of being put to death.

They also shared with me the times that they have been waiting to receive their SIVs. In some cases, they have waited for 10 years. This is unacceptable.

I call on my colleagues to support this legislation so we can protect our allies and reform the system, but also to support the immediate evacuation of our allies in Afghanistan to U.S. soil, where we can ensure their safety.

We can't wait any longer. We need to act now. We need to evacuate all 18,000 allies with pending SIV applications and their immediate families who are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, I met with a young man who is now safely in Houston, but sadly, his father has already been murdered by the Taliban. At least 300, I am told, have already been murdered, just like his father, by the Taliban. The more we delay, the more we put families at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support this bill. We need to support an immediate evacuation. And we need to make sure that our friends who stood with us, that we now stand with them.

□ 0945

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I stand here alongside my colleagues in solidarity that we should be standing with the Afghans who stood together with our men and women in uniform. There is zero question that we should do that, and every veteran that I represent in the Texas 21 District shares that, as we have heard here on this floor.

I am supportive of that underlying principle, however, a self-executing

manager's amendment was included that I had concerns with. It expands the program to include nonprofits and grantees, private organizations, that contributed to the United States mission in Afghanistan.

We don't know who would be included. We don't know how many people would now be eligible.

It expands the program to individuals who worked for the International Security Assistance Force without the need to perform sensitive and trusted activities for the United States forces. These people do not have to be Afghans, and we don't know how many people this would be. It weakens the standard for qualification.

Under current law, an alien has to verify that they have experienced or are experiencing an ongoing serious threat as a consequence of the alien's employment by the United States Government.

The new standard is, has asserted a credible basis for concern about the possibility of an ongoing or serious threat. A credible basis for concern about the possibility of is concerning low, lower than even the credible fear standard of significant possibility we currently employ.

The bill allows for another 8,000 principal aliens to be granted this special immigrant status. We agree we want to try to help those principal aliens. There are 10,000 currently unused. That would be about the 18,000 number. Let's also remember that we have 3½ people come in per person on average. We have had about 125 to 130,000 folks come in. This would be about another 75 to 80,000. That does not include dealing with the NGOs.

So we are now massively expanding this program, which means we are going to be back down here at the well talking about new numbers and more expansions based on nebulous standards with respect to NGOs and private entities that aren't individuals who worked for the United States Government directly alongside our men and women in uniform.

That is more than concerning, and it brings me back to my final point: We have got to restore regular order in this body. We are not amending this, we are not debating it in committee, and we did not have a hearing on the specific manager's amendment that was added. It was just added, put on the floor, and put under the title of something that everyone supports, which means, Mr. Speaker, that you are put in the position of figuring out whether you are going to support the underlying matter while all these things are added to it which have serious concerns we should have debated in committee and debated and amended on the floor.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the ALLIES Act.

I believe, as my colleagues have stated so eloquently, that we have a moral

obligation and a duty to take care of those who protected and safeguarded American troops in Afghanistan.

Future allies will look at how we treated those who put themselves in harm's way: the thousands of interpreters and others who aided our mission when they are asked to help us in other times of need.

There is one particular group I would like to call special attention to: the Afghan Female Tactical Platoon. This small group of elite Afghan women sought a better future for their country. They were trained by our country's Special Forces and supported our special operation missions during the war. They gathered essential intelligence and helped protect the lives of innocent civilians and American troops. We owe these brave women more than our gratitude. We owe them what they gave us: loyalty and protection.

Because of their gender, they are marked for especially heinous retaliation and punishment by the Taliban. Without our help they will almost certainly be raped, sold into sex trafficking, tortured, or executed all because they helped the American people.

I want to thank Representative CROW for his steadfast leadership on this critically important issue, and I urge my colleagues to approve this essential bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), who is the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying: No man left behind; no woman left behind. That is the commitment and that is a promise that we made to the interpreters, to our Afghan partners, that we would not leave them behind in the dust to be slaughtered by the Taliban. They have a bull's-eye on their back. I have talked to them. I have talked to our Special Forces whom they protected in this 20-year war. They will be killed if we don't get them out of there.

Our Defense Department is on a fast track. That entire country—the Taliban is on the offensive—is likely going to fall to the Taliban. The decision to withdraw completely has been made, but we have to be prepared for the aftermath. A refugee crisis and humanitarian crisis will occur. The women in Afghanistan will be tortured and will not be educated. We had a school of 200 women—girls—that were blown up. Little girls were blown up. That, Mr. Speaker, is the Taliban. That will be the same fate for our Afghan partners if we don't get them out of there now.

They have 700 now coming to Fort Lee in Virginia. I urge the administration to get the rest of them. There are 9,000 interpreters, probably 20,000 total when it comes to our Afghan partners. I ask the President to please get them out before they are killed by the Taliban.

Our ISR, or intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, capability is wiped out. The Bagram air base fell to the Afghans in a very sloppy transition, and the Taliban is going to take that over, too. Now we can't see what China, Russia, and Iran are doing. We can't see what ISIS and al-Qaida are doing. We are going dark, Mr. Speaker, because we can't see anything on the ground.

But I can tell you this: The moral obligation we have to save those whom we promised we would protect has to be fulfilled, and that is precisely what this bill does, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Judiciary Committee for bringing this forward.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for offering me this minute and a half, and I thank him for his leadership for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the ALLIES Act. This bill will save lives and protect our allies. It will also honor our commitment to the region. Thousands of Afghans have served as interpreters, drivers, and guides to assist U.S. troops. Their service and commitment have been consistent over the 20 years that now marks the longest U.S. war in history.

The Afghan Special Immigrant Visa, or SIVs, allows people who worked for or on behalf of the United States Government to seek lawful permanent residence in the United States. But as we prepare to remove our troops, the Taliban continues to target our friends. The ALLIES Act of 2021 provides for an additional 8,000 SIVs to accommodate everyone who currently could be an eligible candidate in the pipeline. We have an opportunity and a moral obligation to save the lives of those who served us.

As we draw down our military presence in Afghanistan, many who served alongside our troops continue to face increased threats because of their service to us. We must do the right thing by our brave allies.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CROW for his service and his leadership on this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I came to speak on this bill because it means a lot to me. My war was Vietnam, and I remember the end of that war. I remember the friends that we left behind, I remember the families that were torn apart, and it still weighs on me.

Now I have a son who spent years in Afghanistan, and when he talks to me, he does not talk about taxes or healthcare. He talks about the people he left behind in Afghanistan and what we are doing for them. We cannot do

this again. We must not do this again. We have to rise and bring back and repatriate all the people who were so important to us in combat.

Mr. Speaker, I know you understand that. Please do not abandon friends of America again.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my appreciation to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his leadership in moving this bill forward and certainly to our friend and one who has served this Nation in many ways, Congressman CROW, for his continued consideration of our friends in Afghanistan.

As the co-chair and founder of the Afghanistan Caucus, I have gone to Afghanistan many, many times in the early years. I know the people in Afghanistan truly love democracy. I know the women and children want education, and I know that in the midst of our decision on the longest-serving war, we must find that pathway to be able to ensure democracy prevails, both in terms of the democratic leadership of government but also in the lives of the people.

I hesitate to read this language: "Gunfire erupts. At least a dozen men are seen shot to death amid cries of 'Allahu Akbar', God is great.

"The victims were members of an Afghan Special Forces unit: their executioners, the Taliban. The summary killings took place on June 16 in the town of Dawlat Abad in Faryab Province, close to Afghanistan's border with Turkmenistan." It is, of course, a difficult thing to read and to understand.

But as we begin to write the democratic principles of a constitution so many years ago—prior to this Nation going to Iraq—people were interested and excited about their life. Women were elected as parliamentarians. In fact, they prided themselves on a number of parliamentarians who happened to be women.

In the instance of that leaving Afghanistan the first time, we found that those women, many going to their districts, were killed. Schools for children that girls were in, schools that I took books to, were actually burned to the ground.

So those who stood by us, those who guided our troops, those who translated for us, and those who took us into the villages—because many of you know the stories of our soldiers going in with money. That was the policy at that time—this bill specifically acknowledges their leadership.

I include in the RECORD three articles referencing this important issue.

[From Human Rights Watch, Apr. 1, 2021]  
AFGHANISTAN: TALIBAN TARGET JOURNALISTS, WOMEN IN MEDIA

NEW YORK.—Taliban forces are deliberately targeting journalists and other media workers, including women, in, Human Rights Watch said today. Threats and attacks

against journalists across the country have increased sharply since talks began between the Afghan government and the Taliban, heightening concerns about preserving freedom of expression and the media in any peace settlement.

Human Rights Watch found that Taliban commanders and fighters have engaged in a pattern of threats, intimidation, and violence against members of the media in areas where the Taliban have significant influence, as well as in Kabul. Those making the threats often have an intimate knowledge of a journalist's work, family, and movements and use this information to either compel them to self-censor, leave their work altogether, or face violent consequences. Provincial and district-level Taliban commanders and fighters also make oral and written threats against journalists beyond the areas they control. Journalists say that the widespread nature of the threats has meant that no media workers feel safe.

"A wave of threats and killings has sent a chilling message to the Afghan media at a precarious moment as Afghans on all sides get set to negotiate free speech protections in a future Afghanistan," said Patricia Gossman, associate Asia director. "By silencing critics through threats and violence, the Taliban have undermined hopes for preserving an open society in Afghanistan."

Human Rights Watch interviewed 46 members of the Afghan media between November 2020 and March 2021, seeking information on the conditions under which they work, including threats of physical harm. Those interviewed included 42 journalists in Badghis, Ghazni, Ghor, Helmand, Kabul, Kandahar, Khost, Wardak, and Zabul provinces and four who had left Afghanistan due to threats.

In a number of cases that Human Rights Watch documented, Taliban forces detained journalists for a few hours or overnight. In several cases they or their colleagues were able to contact senior Taliban officials to intercede with provincial and district-level commanders to secure their release, indicating that local commanders are able to take decisions to target journalists on their own without approval from senior Taliban military or political officials.

Taliban officials at their political office in Doha, Qatar, have denied that their forces threaten the media and say that they require only that journalists respect Islamic values. But Taliban commanders throughout Afghanistan have threatened journalists specifically for their reporting. The commanders have considerable autonomy to carry out punishments, including targeted killings.

Women journalists, especially those appearing on television and radio, face particular threats. The recent wave of violent attacks has driven several prominent women journalists to give up their profession or leave Afghanistan altogether. Female reporters may be targeted not only for issues they cover but also for challenging perceived social norms prohibiting women from being in a public role and working outside the home.

Journalists outside the country's main cities are especially vulnerable to attacks because they are more exposed and lack even the minimal protection that a larger Afghan media, government, and international presence provides. However, as the fighting has increasingly encroached on major cities, these have offered decreasing protection to journalists seeking safety from the violence in their home districts.

A journalist covering the fighting in Helmand province said that one of his sources told him the Taliban were looking for him and he should lie low. "The majority

of Afghan journalists feel intimidated and threatened," he said. "All the journalists are scared because everyone feels like they could be next."

Residents of Taliban-held areas have long expressed fear of retaliation if they complain about the way Taliban forces carry out military operations or enforce restrictions. In a June 2020 report, Human Rights Watch documented severe restrictions in areas under Taliban control, including limits on freedom of expression and the media.

The Taliban leadership should immediately cease intimidation, threats, and attacks against journalists and other media workers, Human Rights Watch said. They should urgently provide clear, public directives to all Taliban members to end all forms of violence against journalists and other media workers, and intimidation, harassment, and punishment of Afghans who have criticized Taliban policies. The Taliban leadership should also explicitly reject violence against women in the media.

The United Nations and governments supporting the Intra-Afghan Negotiations should publicly press the Taliban leadership to adopt these recommendations, and provide increased support, including protection, to independent media organizations and journalists in Afghanistan, especially those facing threats.

"It's not enough for Taliban officials in Doha to issue blanket denials that they're targeting journalists when Taliban forces on the ground continue to intimidate, harass, and attack reporters for doing their jobs," Gossman said. "Countries supporting the peace process should press for firm commitments from all parties to protect journalists, including women, and uphold the right to free expression in Afghanistan."

#### TALIBAN THREATS TO AFGHAN MEDIA

Although the Taliban routinely deny responsibility for attacks on journalists, the Afghan Journalists Security Committee (AJSC) has said:

Since the beginning of the spike in targeted killings in early November [2020], supporters of the group [Taliban] have welcomed the killings of journalists on social media, calling these killings in many cases a religious duty. Taliban supporters accuse journalists of being agents of Western countries, and corrupted by Western values, thereby legitimizing any violence against journalists and the media as not only being permissible but a key part of their war.

#### TALIBAN THREATS RELATED TO REPORTING ON THE WAR

Taliban commanders and fighters have long targeted the media, accusing them of being aligned with the Afghan government or international military forces. If journalists report unfavorably about Taliban actions or military operations, the Taliban often accuse them of being spies. District and provincial-level Taliban commanders have also criticized journalists for not reporting incidents such as civilian casualties from government airstrikes. Journalists have said that the role some of them play as influential and prominent figures in many communities has made them targets of the Taliban. By attacking them the Taliban effectively threaten all local media. A journalist in Helmand said:

If the more prominent journalists are targeted first, the other journalists, who might be less influential or prominent, are automatically intimidated and fear for their lives . . . Pro-Taliban accounts on social media . . . explicitly issue warnings to other journalists, along the lines of "learn something from the death of this journalist"—you can be next.

The effect on Afghan media has been profound. The killings and threats have gen-

erated fear among journalists and media workers, many of whom have altered their work patterns in an effort to mitigate the danger or try to be less visible.

Taliban pressure on the media is an apparent part of an effort to shape public debate about the war at a time of heightened political tensions surrounding the peace talks. Local journalists said Taliban commanders and fighters call them to complain about published reports, questioning why a certain issue was covered in a certain way. A journalist in Kandahar said:

The Taliban warned me about reporting on casualties related to a suicide attack. They wanted me to say that a lot of people got killed but I just reported the attacker dying . . . The Taliban threatened a couple of journalists over the last couple years for not reporting on assassinations. They say, 'Why don't you report the actual number?' When we argue with them that it is the correct number, they threaten us.

When one journalist reported a Taliban attack on a civilian facility in Kandahar, he said that within minutes he received death threats and other warnings on his phone. The Taliban called him to say that they had not targeted civilians but a nearby government checkpoint. The journalist said that he lives in fear that the Taliban might still come after him. Other journalists in Kandahar have reported being followed by Taliban fighters. Because of such confrontations, journalists often self-censor their stories.

In Helmand, Taliban commanders targeted journalists who reported on military operations during a Taliban offensive in October. Taliban forces attacked the outskirts of Lashkargah city, overrunning Afghan government checkpoints until US airstrikes drove them back. In the months before he was killed by an improvised explosive device (IED) on November 11, Elyas Dayee, a journalist, had received multiple threats from Taliban commanders in Helmand, warning him to stop his reporting on their military operations. Another reporter covering the fighting said that the morning after his report came out, a Taliban commander called and accused him of publishing reports against the Islamic Emirates and warned that he would face consequences.

#### THE NATURE OF THE THREATS

In Taliban-controlled provinces, threats often come from local commanders with knowledge of the journalist's family, work habits, and movements. These commanders maintain individual contact with journalists and editors, and usually communicate these threats by phone or through social media.

A radio presenter in Zabul province said that he and his colleagues routinely receive threats from the Taliban accusing them of giving the government publicity. The callers always know details about the journalists they call, including their jobs, family members' names, and often their addresses. One caller told him that he should either leave the area or work for the Taliban. When he refused the caller told him he should "count down to his death." He said his relatives also receive these threats and are told to communicate them to him.

In Ghazni province, reporters say that they have been threatened and intimidated by various groups and do not know who is behind every attack. However, despite official denials from the Taliban leadership, comments by Taliban commanders and fighters on social media have led journalists to suspect that the Taliban are responsible for many attacks. These commanders generally have considerable autonomy to plan and carry out military operations independently.

The Afghanistan Journalists Safety Committee said that in Ghazni province, the

Taliban had instructed the majority of the local media outlets that they would only be permitted to continue media activities if they followed Taliban directives. Another journalist in Ghazni said that the Taliban commanders in the province object to any content that is negative or critical about them. Journalists whose reporting is perceived as favorable to the Afghan government may immediately become a target. Leaving their jobs is often their only recourse.

On December 21, Rahmatullah Nekzad, head of the Ghazni journalists' union, was fatally shot as he walked from his home to a local mosque. Although the Taliban spokesman, Zabihullah Mujahid, denied that the group was responsible for the attack, Nekzad had been receiving threats from local Taliban commanders since at least 2019. He said in early December, that the Afghan National Directorate of Security (NDS), the country's intelligence agency, informed him that he and 15 other journalists in Ghazni were at risk of a Taliban attack. He described the threats he received:

I use a social media account to upload daily news. Some local Taliban called me to accuse me of running social media pages that post anti-Taliban news . . . Their argument was that every time you post something on your wall, these . . . are also your accounts. They also threatened people who commented on the post.

In another case in mid-December, Taliban forces stopped the vehicle in which a local journalist was traveling. He called a contact, who then contacted a Taliban official. As a result of this intervention, the local Taliban released him. While he was in their custody, the Taliban accused him of working for the government's intelligence agency and for "foreigners."

Journalists have also been threatened for reporting on Taliban abuses. A radio correspondent from Badghis province said that after he and his colleagues broadcast a report about the Taliban extorting payments from highway drivers, the journalists began to receive threats:

In addition to the radio, we have a Facebook page where we publish the news of the day. After I posted this story, one of the comments read: "The martyrs of the Islamic Emirate will soon kill the employees of this media station." The same message came in [Facebook] Messenger. Since then, we report less news on Facebook now. Badghis's capital is a very small city. Everyone knows each other and I have no doubt that they also know the address of our office.

Another journalist from Badghis said that in November, as he was traveling from Herat to Badghis province, Taliban fighters stopped him and forced him out of his car. They interrogated him about whether he had cooperated with government security forces and threatened to kill him. He said that his family was aware that he was on the road. He was finally released after local and ethnic Taliban elders who knew them mediated his release. "I am still in fear and . . . shock from this incident," he said. "Now I publish less news of the war. Whenever I go to a press conference, I am fearful and cautious. I only cover news from the capital now."

Local Taliban fighters have assaulted journalists who have traveled into Taliban-controlled districts. A journalist from Wardak province said that a group of Taliban fighters stopped and beat him and another reporter, accusing them of spying and "going around without the Taliban's permission to take pictures, record videos, and talk to people." The journalists showed their press identification but were not released until after they called a contact, who then informed senior Taliban officials, who ordered them released.

Threats also come in writing. A journalist in Ghazni said that a letter was dropped by his house ordering him to meet with the local Taliban because his reports were not "neutral." It warned him that if he did not change, his death was "close." After the warning, he left his home district and stayed in Kabul for a few months. Eventually he returned home but avoided his office out of fear.

The Taliban also send cell phone text messages to comment on media coverage, often chiding reporters that they should have included the Taliban point of view. While criticism of media reporting is not in itself problematic, when it comes from an armed group with a history of killing journalists, the messages are intimidating and create fear. "Being a journalist is something that can put your life in danger without even doing anything specific to antagonize the Taliban," one journalist in Ghazni said.

Journalists also receive threats when they share their political views on social media. Taliban commanders also use Facebook to issue threats. A journalist in Ghazni said that shortly after he posted a government statement on a military offensive that resulted in Taliban casualties, he received a message from a Taliban commander demanding to speak with him:

He told me not to listen to what [government officials] say and ordered me to come see him. I had to comply. He came with his men in a Toyota vehicle. He threatened me and told me not to post anything more on Facebook.

Another journalist in Ghazni had a similar experience after using Facebook to post his report on the police killing a suspected Taliban bomber. He received a call from a man who said he was with the Taliban and asked him why he was publishing inaccurate information. The man warned him that they would watch out for what he published and that he should not publish such reports anymore.

Local Taliban commanders issue warnings about radio and television stations airing music programs, which they consider prohibited, and blame journalists for this practice. One journalist described the threats he received:

Whenever the Taliban hears about music on local radio channels, they immediately start calling you, threatening to kill you. They told me many times that they held court sessions about me, proving that I am guilty of broadcasting music. They threatened to kill me. I left this job because of these threats.

The journalist said that local Taliban officials had also told him not to broadcast election-related news because elections were "US-instigated." He said: "I argued with them for a couple of months that this is not my personal choice but the station's editorial decision. Then the Taliban asked for my boss' number and threatened him until he left." Another Ghazni reporter said he had received at least six threats in which callers warned him of vague consequences if he did not remove music or make other changes to the programs.

Threatening to harm relatives is a common tactic to spread fear. A journalist in Khost said that he received threatening calls from unknown numbers, some accusing him of working for Christians, others accusing him of being a foreign spy. Some specifically warn him that they know his relatives and where he lives:

I am terrified but cannot do anything about it . . . One of my relatives said that I should leave [journalism] because he is scared . . . I cannot carry on with my work. I cannot go outside freely. A caller shared a lot of information about me as proof that

they have been watching me—he told me my name, my father's name, where I work, and the address of my house . . . after a few days, I got a message saying "the path you have chosen is not the right path, so you should move on from it or else we will decide what to do with you."

For the time being, the journalist has changed his phone hoping to prevent further threats.

#### TALIBAN THREATS TO WOMEN IN THE MEDIA

The Afghan Journalists Safety Committee reported that 14 women working for media outlets in Afghanistan were threatened or violently attacked in 2020. An increasing number of Afghan women in journalism have left the profession because of worsening security and threats, a trend that emerged after 2015 and has accelerated.

The Islamic State of Khorasan Province (ISKP), an armed group affiliated with the Islamic State (also known as ISIS), took responsibility for killing four women journalists and media workers, including Malala Maiwand, the first woman TV presenter for Enikass News, on December 10, and the March 2 killings of Mursal Waheedi, Saadia Sadat, and Shahnaz Raufi, who worked at Enikass News dubbing foreign language news reports.

It is often not clear whether the ISKP, the Taliban, or other groups are responsible for some threats and attacks against women. In Ghazni province, the Taliban have instructed media outlets that the hosts of entertainment programs should not be women, and that no music should be broadcasted.

Farahnaz Forotan, one of Afghanistan's best-known journalists noted for her hard-hitting interviews on Tolo News, left the country in November after hearing that she was on a Taliban blacklist and would soon be killed.

She said that the Taliban: do not accept free media, and, in many events, they had rejected being interviewed by women. The reason they wanted to kill me, was because as a woman I am not accepted according to their values . . . The situation in Kabul is very scary. I know four journalists in Kandahar who left their jobs. The local media does not reflect it because they cannot. They are being threatened and the government cannot provide protection . . . Every morning I check messages to make sure that everyone is safe. I live with fear—it is very difficult to live with the fear of losing a loved one.

Another Kabul-based journalist had worked as a producer for a television news outlet but left her job in mid-2020 after receiving threats. She said:

The Taliban threatened me a couple of times on the phone, and they told me to leave my job. I also found a letter from the Taliban in a hole in our door. The letter repeated that I must not work anymore for news agencies because this job doesn't suit me morally. If you continue, then you have no right to complain [about the consequences].

[From the New York Times, July 22, 2021]

#### U.S. SCRAMBLES TO MOVE TRANSLATORS FROM AFGHANISTAN WHILE LEAVING MANY IN LIMBO

An additional 4,000 Afghans who worked with American forces, many of them interpreters, had been approved to relocate to the United States with their families in light of the withdrawal of U.S. troops, State Department officials said on Wednesday.

But officials added that evacuations were only taking place out of Kabul, the capital, and any eligible Afghans in remote areas were on their own in figuring out how to make the difficult, and likely dangerous,

journey if they wanted to take advantage of the offer.

"In order to come on an evacuation flight, they would have to get themselves to Kabul," a senior official, who requested anonymity in order to discuss the plan in detail, said on a call with reporters. "Obviously, we don't have extensive U.S. military presence. We don't have the ability to provide transportation for them."

"If they're staying in the north of the country and they don't feel safe staying in Afghanistan, they could go to a neighboring country" and finish their application process there, the official added.

The United States also will not provide security to applicants outside Kabul, many of whom are under direct threat from the Taliban for cooperating with coalition forces during the war.

With the American military in the final phases of withdrawing from Afghanistan, the White House has come under pressure to protect Afghan allies and speed up the process of providing them with special immigrant visas, and President Biden has vowed to do so. There have been about 20,000 applicants for the special visa program.

This month, 2,500 Afghans will be sent in stages to an Army base in Fort Lee, Va., south of Richmond, where they will wait roughly 10 days for final processing. The next 4,000 applicants, who need further approvals, will go with their families to other countries to complete the visa process before coming to the United States, the senior official said.

The official did not indicate which countries those applicants would be sent to complete the visa process.

The House is expected to pass legislation this week increasing the number of State Department special immigrant visas and streamlining the application process.

[From Time Magazine, June 15, 2021]

WE MUST HELP THE AFGHAN INTERPRETERS  
WHO HELPED US

(By Florent Groberg)

Groberg received the Medal of Honor during combat operations in Afghanistan, and is on the Advisory Board of With Honor Action.

I lived by these words. That includes the day a suicide bomber hit and killed four men in my patrol in Asadabad, Afghanistan: Sergeant Major Kevin J. Griffin, Major Thomas E. Kennedy, Major Walter D. Gray, and USAID Foreign Service Officer Mr. Ragaai Abdelfattah. I think about them every day.

The blast knocked me out. I woke up as my medic strapped a tourniquet to my leg and turned to my Afghan interpreter to assist with bandages. Patrol after patrol, year after year, for twenty years, our Afghan interpreters have stood by our side in harm's way. Now we have a choice to stand by them.

Taliban militants and terrorists have long targeted our interpreters, including their wives and children. By the time the U.S. withdraws from Afghanistan in September 2021, there will be little defense left for these loyal allies.

Another one of my Afghan interpreters reached out to me last week. He made it out of Afghanistan but his wife and kids are trapped and targeted. "The situation is getting worse day by day in Afghanistan. I am worried for my wife and kids," he wrote, "Please help."

More than 17,000 Afghans who worked with U.S. forces, not to mention their family members, are still waiting for a decision from the U.S. Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) program. The process is mired in a maddening bureaucracy. Many have waited for years after going through security checks with practically every U.S. government

agency imaginable, often at their own expense for health screenings and other requirements. The situation has only become more dire of late with the U.S. Embassy in Kabul halting visa applicant interviews because of an escalating COVID-19 outbreak in Afghanistan.

Every soldier I have spoken with who served in Afghanistan supports granting asylum for loyal Afghan interpreters who have taken all the necessary security steps and are seeking this emergency asylum. Not only is granting asylum the right thing to do, it also benefits the U.S. by accepting talented and hardworking people, many of whom have already put it all on the line for our country.

Members of the For Country Caucus in the U.S. House are leading the charge, including Democratic Representatives Jason Crow, Jared Golden, and Seth Moulton, and Republicans Don Bacon, Adam Kinzinger, Peter Meijer, and Michael Waltz. These veterans have formed a task force and called on the White House, State Department, and Defense Department to immediately create a plan that can be executed before the final withdrawal of U.S. forces this September. Senator Jeanne Shaheen and U.S. Army veterans Senator Joni Ernst and Senator Jack Reed are forming a bipartisan coalition in the Senate.

"My concern is very simple," Representative Crow said, "And that is if we pull out and don't protect our Afghan partners, many of them will be killed."

Earlier this year, The Atlantic reported that Taliban militants hunted down and killed "Mohammad," an interpreter who worked with U.S. forces for a decade and then spent nearly another decade trying to get through the SIV process with his wife and kids. Mohammad's family just learned they finally have been approved for humanitarian parole. They are scheduled to be resettled in Texas shortly. My hope is we will hear many more stories of brave Afghan families, including that of my own interpreter, who will be granted asylum and can begin the next chapter of their lives in peace and shared prosperity.

This will only happen if the U.S. steps up and protects the interpreters and families under threat. Our history points us to solutions. The Ford Administration evacuated over 130,000 Vietnamese to Guam at the end of the Vietnam War. The Clinton Administration did the same for Iraqi Kurds during Saddam Hussein's regime.

Whether through an emergency evacuation, an expedited SIV process, an expansion of other refugee and humanitarian programs, or a combination of all of these, the Biden administration should urgently make a plan and execute it.

I am blessed to be a first-generation American and U.S. Army veteran who served with patriots, some of whom made the ultimate sacrifice. Our Afghan interpreters are patriots, too. Now is the time to open our arms and stand by them, their wives, and their children.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I support the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program, and I support its increased numbers. I ask my colleagues: Don't stop here. Let's keep going. These are our friends, and democracy must prevail.

Mr. Speaker, against the backdrop of a war that has demanded sacrifice and summoned patriotism, I rise in unequivocal support of H.R. 3985, "The Allies Act of 2021," which honors the contributions of our allies in Afghanistan by strengthening the Afghan Special Immigration Visa (SIV) Program.

I wish to recognize my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, Con-

gressman CROW, who valiantly served three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, for leading this bipartisan effort to uphold our commitment to our partners in Afghanistan.

This piece of legislation, which I am proud to co-sponsor, comes as we conclude a multigenerational war that has accomplished its principle objectives: rendering justice to those responsible for 9/11 and making sure that no attack on the homeland ever emerges from Afghanistan.

Over the course of achieving this mission, we found critical allies and made invaluable friends, among them those who leveraged their skills and knowledge to protect our troops from harm.

The Afghan Special Immigrant (SIV) Program, created in 2009 to provide safety for Afghan interpreters, contractors, and security personnel assisting U.S. efforts in the country, is more than a program.

It is a promise—a promise to our allies that when they have our back, we have theirs.

Specifically, the bill improves the SIV application process by:

- amending the credible threat requirement; aligning applicant standards;
- clarifying eligibility for certain Afghans;
- streamlining duplicative procedures, and,
- increasing protections for surviving spouses.

Reports on the ground indicate those Afghan nationals who worked on behalf of the U.S. Government face extreme danger.

Time is of the essence, and this bill removes our friends and allies from the bureaucratic barriers of additional lengthy paperwork to establish a credible threat, when we already know that such a threat exists for individuals with verified ties to the U.S. government.

Additionally, to qualify for the Afghan SIV Program under the current law, Afghan nationals who were employed by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) or Resolute Support (RS) must have performed "sensitive and trusted" work.

This employment requirement was removed for U.S. Government employees in the FY2020 National Defense Authorization Act, but it remains for individuals employed under ISAF and RS.

All current applicants must also submit an I-360 petition to USCIS after completing the State Department's Chief of Mission process.

This redundancy creates duplicative applications and introduces a gap in the process that allows for fraudulent petitions, ultimately slowing down the processing time for all applicants.

The Allies Act of 2021 aligns standards across all types of employment and gives the Department of Homeland Security the flexibility to not require I-360 petitions in cases where applicants have already proven eligibility through the Chief of Mission Process.

By making standards uniform, clear, and nonduplicative for all applicants, this bill streamlines application processing and ensures a more efficient safety plan for all our allies.

The bill also expands the types of individuals eligible for the SIV.

In practice, the original Afghan SIV statute only includes Afghan nationals who worked under U.S. government contracts.

Yet we received support from many Afghan nationals under nongovernmental cooperative agreements and grants, including many key contacts working on critical democracy, human



rights, and governance work to assist the U.S. mission in Afghanistan.

This bill makes clear that Afghan nationals that worked under such non-governmental agreements to advance the U.S. mission are eligible for the Afghan SIV program.

In addition to previously excluded contractors, we must also acknowledge the danger surviving spouses face and place them at the front and center in our migration support efforts as well.

Currently, surviving spouses of deceased SIV applicants are not allowed to continue through the process if the primary SIV applicant died before visa approval.

The immediate families of our allies are also our allies and we must remove this dangerous obstacle for them to reach safety.

The Allies Act of 2021 allows family members of deceased primary applicants to continue through the process if their spouse had applied for Chief of Mission approval.

We cannot leave our Afghan allies and their spouses vulnerable to the imminent threat of revenge from the Taliban.

They simply are not safe at home and they need our help.

The adaptations and amendments that this act offers would facilitate a path to safety and freedom for nearly 20,000 of on-the-ground partners whose work made possible all our advancements in that country.

Madam Speaker, I urge us to act with compassion and honor our core American value of promoting freedom for all, for it was our reverence for this value that characterized our extended presence in Afghanistan in the first place.

It is time for us to ensure the safety and lives of our friends and allies in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership and for the 2 minutes, which may be the most important 2 minutes I have had on the floor in a very, very long time, because what we debate here today is not an ideological disagreement. It is not a question of whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, Mr. Speaker. It is a fundamental question of who we are as a country and will we abide by the values that not only make us successful in times of war, but which distinguish us as a people and allow us to say that we are an exceptional nation.

When our troops—troops like JASON CROW, the sponsor of this legislation—go to engage in combat in foreign lands, they are armed and equipped with the very best technology money can buy. But from the human standpoint, from the all-important humanitarian and cultural standpoint, they are blind and deaf. That is fixed by locals who risk everything, not necessarily for the money, but because they believe in who we are. This is the moment when we return the favor by saying: If you stood with us, we will stand with you.

It is far from a national security perspective, because God help those who

go into a country if we don't take care of those who helped us in Afghanistan. But, more importantly, it is about our values.

Mr. Speaker, you know very well that our military has at its core the value that we leave no one behind. Now we decide whether we live by that value or whether we take the cheap, the easy, the quick, and ultimately, the dangerous way out. It is dangerous for the next conflict we find ourselves in and dangerous because of what that will tell the world about our commitment to loyalty and the values that make us exceptional.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

□ 1000

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

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that my colleague from Maryland, the distinguished ANTHONY BROWN, is presiding, having served in Iraq and served in the U.S. Army for a 30-year stint.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Representative CROW, for his leadership on this issue and in offering this legislation.

Representative CROW, like Congressman BROWN, is one of the Members of this House from a new generation of service who wore the uniform of our country in the post-9/11 conflicts.

These veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, like Representative CROW, understand what we must do to support our friends who stood with us, who risked their lives and the lives of their families with their American partners.

The mission of our Armed Forces in Afghanistan over the past 20 years has been clear, although very extended: destroy the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 and deny al-Qaida a safe haven from which to threaten global security in our country. Today, Osama bin Laden is dead and al-Qaida has been routed. Terrorism, however, has not gone away.

Our troops are now coming home. The fate of the Afghan people will surely be determined by them, with our help, with us standing by. America will continue to support the Afghan Government and its security forces, but it is up to them to show the Taliban that there is no military solution and that their resolve is evident by their defense of their Nation.

As American personnel return from Afghanistan, that country's civil war will continue, and we cannot leave our Afghan partners behind. We talk about leaving no American behind. That is an absolutely essential premise as we send our men and women into harm's way. Nor should we leave behind any of those who facilitated our efforts, who stood with us, who risked their own lives and put themselves in jeopardy.

No one has any illusions about what the Taliban would do if they had their way and what they will do in those places they already control. They will take it out, and they will, in fact, literally take out those who stood with us and facilitated our efforts. There can be no doubt the punishment they would inflict on Afghans who stood alongside the United States and our allies.

We can only imagine the horrors that would befall their families in retribution. This legislation recognizes that these Afghan allies have earned safety in our country for themselves and for their loved ones. It would expand the visa program and expedite processing to help ensure there is a path to America for Afghans who worked side by side with our troops, our diplomats, our development professionals, and our partner forces in carrying out our missions there.

While President Biden is already taking executive action to bring some of these allies here, legislation is needed to ensure that all of them can make it safely out of harm's way. It should be said, of course, that they will all be vetted to ensure that, in fact, they are coming to the United States and will be consistent with the security of our country and our people.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill today in a very bipartisan way. This is not about Democrats. It is not about Republicans. It is about an effort that Republican and Democratic administrations pursued and received help in doing so. Each vote is not only an assent for this sound policy, but a gesture of our deep appreciation for the service of our allies.

Let this vote remind the world that our country's steadfast foundation, our highest ideal remains our bonds of friendship, loyalty, and trust. Let us remind our friends and foes alike that Americans keep faith with our allies, and let us practice that in this body and at the White House.

I ask my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike: Vote for this bill. We can argue about differences of opinion on our effort in Afghanistan, but when we do something, whether we argue one side or the other, when we ask people to help us in that effort, help us, America, our men and women in uniform in harm's way, when we ask those to help us, it is important for us to keep the faith with those who do. Vote "yes."

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER).

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Allies Act. It is our moral obligation to honor the promises we made to our Afghan allies and ensure that those who risked their lives for the U.S. mission are safely relocated, but it is patently clear that the Special Immigrant Visa program, as it currently exists, is not up to the task. Staffing shortages and bureaucratic hurdles have resulted in years-long delays in the process and a backlog of over 18,000 applications.

The Allies Act will help speed up the process by streamlining duplicative procedures and removing unnecessary requirements, while maintaining the necessary security and vetting procedures. It also expands eligibility for those who are unfairly left out of the program, most critically, surviving spouses and children of applicants who died or were killed by the Taliban before visa approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the recent news of the plans to begin evacuating some of these Afghan interpreters, but make no mistake, there is much more to be done. We have a responsibility to ensure that those who risked their lives serving alongside U.S. and coalition forces are both swiftly evacuated and given a path to safety.

This bill is a significant step toward that goal and will help ensure that America lives up to the promises made to those brave individuals and their families. I am proud to support this bill, and I call on all of my colleagues to do so today. I urge passage.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

I never served in theater, but I have worked on this issue for 14 years. We started with Senator John McCain and Senator Kennedy, and it moved forward on a bipartisan basis, both the House and the Senate, with the special immigrant visa. But, sadly, it always was too slow, too bureaucratic, and there really wasn't the sense of urgency that was necessary to make sure that the people who put their lives on the line to help Americans in these difficult circumstances were dealt with.

Something has changed. First of all, President Biden has made an extraordinarily difficult call that we are going to wind down that presence of the United States in terms of military. It is a difficult call. It was one that needed to be made because the circumstances were not going to change. If it was 5 years, 10 years, it would just be more billions of dollars and more lives; putting off the day of reckoning.

I admire the President for doing so, but I hope he brings that same sense of urgency to deal with these people who we can't afford to leave behind.

Another thing that has changed is the energy of new Members of Congress who served in the theater; my colleague, JASON CROW. We just heard from PETER MELJER. They have added a sense of urgency on a bipartisan basis that has helped us craft this legislation, that will solve the problems if we are willing to implement it in full force.

I call upon the administration to expedite the transition. I call on all of us to continue to make sure that we provide the resources, the attention, and the urgency to make the program successful. But make no mistake, we have

a lot of work to do to protect people who helped us. Being a friend should not be fatal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this legislation as an important next step and urge that we redouble our efforts to make it successful.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, 51, that is how many days until our official withdrawal from Afghanistan; 800, that is how many days it takes to process a single special immigrant visa; 21,000, that is how many of our Afghan allies put their lives on the line, not just for their country, but for ours, who are at risk of being beaten, tortured, beheaded, and slaughtered by the Taliban. And make no mistake, if they can get their hands on our friends, that is what the Taliban will do.

So the math is clear. We are out of time. The stakes are clear. Our reputation as a country, our ability to find allies in future conflicts, the willingness of people all over the globe to work for America because they trust us to uphold our own values, that is what is on the line.

We have to pass the Allies Act. The administration needs to conduct a full evacuation because we do not leave people behind. We are the United States of America. Let's remind the world of that today.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a tragedy in so many ways; the loss of so many of the best and brightest of our youth because of political and military leaders who were willing to put them in harm's way but without a commitment to victory and without the willingness to back them with the full might of the United States.

For Afghanistan, it means the best and brightest of that country, the very people who were willing to risk their futures for freedom are the ones who are now being forced to flee, depriving Afghanistan of the most patriotic citizens who could otherwise have formed the core of a free government if we had finished the job we started.

It is to be greatly hoped that like the Iranian diaspora, they will focus their energy from abroad to support the resistance movement that is sure to emerge under the yoke of Taliban oppression. It is to be greatly hoped that our Nation will finally return to a tradition that served us well for nearly 200 years; that there is no substitute for victory and no excuse for waging war without the absolute commitment to swiftly win it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am heartened to see Members on both sides of the aisle

speak in support of this important bill. It is vital that we pass this legislation and it is vital that we do so quickly. As we speak, nearly 20,000 of our Afghan allies are facing increasing threats from the Taliban and insurgent groups. The administration will begin evacuating some individuals at the end of this month.

As Members of Congress, we must also do our part to honor the sacrifices made by these brave men and women and pass the Allies Act. It is much too bad that we cannot do more, but this is the least that we can do. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, many Members here, including myself, have traveled to Afghanistan for years to express our gratitude to our heroic men and women in uniform serving there. We remain in awe of their patriotism and courage.

And just as awe-inspiring are their partners on the ground: the local Afghan interpreters, drivers, embassy staff, contractors, security personnel and others who have worked shoulder-to-shoulder with the American military and our diplomatic personnel.

These Afghan partners have been vital to the safety of American lives and to the success of our mission. They accepted an extraordinary risk to their lives and families, with the understanding that we would stand by them.

And now, they are under attack—facing the threat of deadly retribution from the Taliban.

Today, with the ALLIES Act, the U.S. Congress is honoring our promises to these brave heroes: to respect their service and to not leave them behind.

Thank you to Congressman JASON CROW—a former Army Ranger who served our Nation in Afghanistan and Iraq.

He, with Congressman SETH MOULTON and the entire bipartisan "Honoring our Promises" Working Group, has been firm, principled and relentless in fighting for this legislation and other action to protect our "Afghan allies."

Earlier this summer, with their leadership, the House proudly passed the HOPE for Afghan SIVS Act, which took the first step in that mission.

This group has also been instrumental in coordinating Congress's response with the Biden-Harris Administration.

As President Biden has said, "Those who helped us are not going to be left behind." And with his action this week, evacuating Afghan partners to Fort Lee as they await final processing, that promise is being honored.

The Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act will fix the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) process, created over a decade ago to provide safety for Afghan interpreters, contractors, security personnel and others who worked with the United States.

Sadly and unconscionably, the SIV process has long been plagued by severe delays and backlogs, leaving many applicants waiting years for their visas—and hundreds have been killed before receiving approval.

Currently, there are many thousands of applicants in the pipeline, not including their spouses and children. This delay is not only demoralizing—it is deadly, because of the imminent danger posed by Taliban.

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

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

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

According to the nonprofit organization *One Left Behind*, more than 300 translators and their family members have been killed since 2014. Many died while waiting for their visas to be processed.

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

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

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

These courageous allies cannot wait a day longer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 16, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]  
YEAS—407

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

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

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

NAYS—16

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

NOT VOTING—7

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

□ 1047

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

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

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

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

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

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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