Hartzler (Bucshon)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Huffman (Stanton)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Jones (Jacobs (CA))
Kahele (Case)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Clark (MA))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lynch (Trahan)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Jeffries)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Ocasio-Cortez (Escobar)
Payne (Pallone)
Perlmutter (Neguse)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Rush (Underwood)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Crawford)
Suozzi (Panetta)
Timmons (Reschenthaler)
Vela (Correa)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Waltz (Diaz-Balart)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Williams (GA) (Jacobs (CA))
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

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. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

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

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

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed, as usual, until 6:30 p.m.

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

And on Wednesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Madam Speaker, the House will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

With the short-term extension of the Surface Transportation Program through October 31, the House will aim to consider the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Build Back Better Act this work period.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2119, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act of 2021, sponsored by LUCY MCBATH of Georgia. That bill modifies and expands and reauthorizes, through fiscal year 2026, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program, which funds emergency shelters and supports related assistance for victims of domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, if time allows, the House may also consider H.R. 3992, the Protecting Older Jobs Applicants Act, which allows applicants to bring disparate impact claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 when they experience discrimination while seeking a job.

Lastly, additional legislative items may be possible when and if they are ready.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As we go through the bills that may come up next week—of course, we just finished a week bringing some bills to the floor, but as we look around the country, clearly the main concern we are hearing from families are all of the various crises that are facing American families.

You have an inflation crises with goods of all kinds costing dramatically more when people go to buy things at the grocery store. If they try to get a new appliance, they are waiting longer, they are paying more money.

You think about the energy crisis with families paying 50 percent more for gasoline, in some cases, with dramatic increases at the pump and the pain that it causes, especially lower income families.

The border crisis, where every day we see stories of thousands of people coming across our border illegally. The Attorney General was before the Committee on the Judiciary and he couldn't even give a number of how many people have illegally crossed or plan to address it.

The supply chain crisis that we see getting worse and worse with ships backed up, maybe almost all the way to China, because that crisis is not being addressed.

So when you think about all these crises that families are angry about—it is hurting hardworking families, it is costing them, it is taking money out of their paychecks—there has not been a single bill brought to this floor last week. It doesn't sound like any is being brought to the floor next week to address any of those crises.

I would ask the gentleman, would he be open to bringing actual legislation to the floor to address the various, serious crises that families are facing today?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and question.

Let me say that I mentioned two bills that will have a very, very substantial impact on the welfare of Americans, of their families, of their health, and yes, even of their environmental security in the Build Back Better plan and the BIP plan, which is a bipartisan bill on the Senate side.

I hope to bring both of those bills to the floor next week, if they are ready. Unfortunately, we don't have help from your side on either of those bills so it is more difficult to get unanimity on our side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I will tell my friend, all those problems that you mentioned, would be extraordinarily worse if we hadn't passed the American Rescue Plan in March of this year, which helped families extraordinarily and generously to stay above water. Not a single person on your side of the aisle voted for those.

So when the gentleman asked me, are we going to bring legislation to the floor, we brought it to the floor. You all opposed it, however—unfortunately—that helped families, helped childcare, helped healthcare, helped health workers, helped States all to meet the pandemic that this administration inherited.

The pandemic was not the previous administration's fault, obviously, but the failure to deal with it effectively was their fault.

So I tell the gentleman that 5 million jobs have been created since this administration took office. Some people lamented the 233,000 jobs last month, how awful that was.

In the best year that Donald Trump had, that was his average production of jobs—in the best year he had, which was from January 2018 to January 2019.

So I will tell my friend, we hope to be able to bring these bills to the floor. We think they will have a very substantial, positive impact. We inherited, of course, because of the pandemic—again, not the fault of any—well, we don't know whether it was the fault of somebody purposely, but in any event, for whatever reasons, extraordinary amounts of people were laid off around the world.

□ 1145

Then, because of the American Rescue Plan, we finally gave some people the resources that they could buy things that they had needed and wanted for them and their families, and now we have a supply shortage.

The President acted through executive order, as the gentleman knows, to make sure that we had a 24/7 operation at the ports off Long Beach, off other ports in our country, to try to make sure that we, A, got goods on those ships that you say are to China—I don't know whether they are to China, but there are a lot of them; you are absolutely right on that—to get them offloaded, to get them on trucks, and to get them to where they could be distributed and available for businesses.

Then, of course, we have a substantial shortage of chips, which the gentleman knows, which was caused by a lockdown for major producers—Singapore being one—of chips.

So, we are dealing with that. The executive is dealing with that as well.

I very much hope the gentleman will help us get that legislation passed, which will make a major difference. Who says? Fourteen or 17 laureates who wrote to the White House and said if these bills passed, it is not only going to help jobs, it is not only going to help climate, it is not only going to help health, but it is also going to help bring down inflation, which is a problem.

Why do we have inflation? Because we have too many dollars chasing too few goods, so prices go up. That is true of employment as well, which probably is good news in terms of salaries going up for people around the country.

I tell my friend that we do have some very substantial, important legislation

that we are trying to get done. It would be a lot easier to get it done if we had help from your side of the aisle. And your answer will be, well, it would be very helpful if you would take some of our ideas. I get that.

I will also tell you, if the gentleman is concerned about all of those issues, if we don't protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America, they will all get disastrously worse. And not one of you is prepared, in a debt that we all created, all of us, not all on the same thing—it may have been cutting revenues, increasing spending, this, that, and the other.

We all essentially voted for very substantial spending last year to meet the crisis of the pandemic. All of us did. The CARES Act, the largest of those, $2 trillion, was unanimously passed by a voice vote in one instance.

The only thing I would say to the gentleman is that we are very, very concerned about what is happening. We are very glad that we created 5 million jobs. Nine million jobs were lost the year before under Mr. Trump. He had a net loss of 2 million jobs over his 4 years—a net loss of 2 million jobs. This President has a net gain, and we are going to try to continue that. I hope we get some help from your side of the aisle.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, clearly, we stand ready to help on all of those issues. But had Washington spending and borrowing money solved the problem, we would not have any of these crises because trillions of dollars have been borrowed and spent under this administration.

In the previous administration, we worked together on those budget deals, every one of them. The Paycheck Protection Program and the CARES Act were all very bipartisan, and it included addressing the debt that went along with it.

There has been nothing bipartisan in any of the debt that has been racked up under this administration. So if the gentleman is concerned about the full faith and credit of the United States, which we all are, then stop borrowing and spending trillions more dollars.

Families get this, by the way. Families know that if spending trillions was going to solve the problem, there wouldn't be a problem because trillions have been borrowed and spent just from January to October. What they know is it is the very borrowing and spending of trillions of dollars in Washington that has exacerbated these problems.

The inflation crisis would not exist if you didn't have Washington borrowing and spending trillions more dollars, making it harder for people to get back into the workforce, making it harder for the supply chain to be addressed.

What was inherited? I think we know what was inherited by the Biden administration. We had energy dominance the day President Biden took the oath of office. Not only were we producing enough energy for our needs, but gas was less than $2 a gallon all across America. We were exporting oil and natural gas to our friends around the world. We were undermining our enemies around the world.

Instead of President Biden begging OPEC and Russia to produce more oil, we were actually shipping oil and gas to our friends because we could produce enough for ourselves. We created great American jobs here at home. We had low-cost energy.

By the way, the technological advances we made here in this country, if there is anywhere in the world where fossil fuel production is going to be done, you want it done here because we have actually lowered carbon emissions. We were lowering carbon emissions in America while producing more energy. Now we have become more reliant on OPEC nations, on Russia.

Not only is that bad for American families, but they are paying more at the pump because of that crisis created by President Biden's actions. He inherited an energy-dominant Nation. Now you have the President of the United States begging OPEC and Russia to produce more oil, which they are not going to do because they want oil to be over $80 a barrel, but they actually emit more carbon to produce the same oil.

Oil is going to be needed to run an economy, any economy anywhere in the world. You want to make it here because we do it better than anybody else. But that is not what is being done. We have an answer for it.

I know, last night, President Biden was asked specifically about this crisis that he created. His response was, ''I don't have a near-term answer'' for high gas prices.

Well, President Biden might not have an answer, but we do. We have a number of bills, and I know the gentleman has pointed it out. We have a number of answers.

Here is one. H.R. 684 green-lights the Keystone pipeline. You want to talk about creating thousands of good jobs, private-sector money, more energy independence for America; this bill would do just that, and it would do it today.

If pipelines were a problem—I know President Biden doesn't want American pipelines, but he green-lighted the Russian pipeline, the Nord Stream II. So, clearly, it is not pipelines; it is American pipelines he doesn't want.

Why don't we bring up H.R. 684 to create jobs and lower energy costs? H.R. 543 and H.R. 859 would both green-light more production in America that President Biden shut down. There was production going on all across America, really good, safe, environmentally sound production. Again, our standards are the best in the world.

For people who want to bash America, go find a country that produces energy that does it better than America. We do it best. Yet, President Biden, through executive action, shut a lot of that production down. These bills would open that back up again. These bills would lower gas prices.

I know President Biden isn't interested in that because, in his own budget, he specifically blocks the Corps of Engineers from doing infrastructure projects that would lower energy production. President Biden blocks that. You would think OPEC would have come up with that idea or maybe Russia would have come up with that idea. No, that was President Biden in his own budget who said you can't even do infrastructure projects if it lowers energy production. Who would come up with that? Yet, that is in his budget.

Then you go to the border crisis, again, self-created. President Biden inherited a secure border. A wall was being built. You had agreements with South American and Central American countries.

Remain in Mexico was a great policy that President Biden reversed; he blocked it. Did he block it because it was bad policy? No, it was working really well. It was an agreement between two neighboring countries. He just blocked it because President Trump did it. It was working, yet he got rid of it. He could go and reinstate that tomorrow.

We have bills that would solve the border crisis. I will read a few of them off.

H.R. 4828 is a bill I brought to the majority leader's attention back a month ago, in September. This is a bill that deals with a number of problems facing our border today, and it would give more tools to our Border Patrol agents to secure our border.

H.R. 471 is another bill I brought to the gentleman's attention a month ago that would help secure America's border, dealing with the crisis.

None of these bills seem to draw the interest of the majority even though every one of them would address these very real crises facing families that were not around a year ago.

President Biden inherited a secure border; he inherited energy dominance; and he inherited an economy that was recovering from the worst pandemic we have seen in lifetimes. Then, on top of that, there is a proposal to raise trillions more in taxes, more in Soviet-style spending coming out of Washington that would make inflation worse.

The gentleman is correct. We don't support those ideas that would make inflation worse, that would raise gas prices even higher. But we bring a lot of good ideas that would address these crises. We just want to see these ideas brought to the floor.

When you look at the floor schedule and there is nothing last week, next week, a month ago to address any of these crises, these are the things that families are having the hardest time with, and they are struggling.

Inflation is the biggest tax on lower and middle-income families. President Biden promised he wouldn't raise taxes on anybody making less than $400,000.

Yet, in the tax proposal that President Biden wants to bring forward by next week so that he can go fly to Europe and talk about other proposals that would make it impossible to produce energy in America, they include, among other things, a natural gas tax. That tax would fall the hardest on lower income families, not the millionaires and the billionaires. It would be people making less than $60,000 that would be hit the hardest by a natural gas tax. Yet, it is in the bill.

You talk about adding 83,000 IRS agents. Maybe some people in Washington think that is job creation. Most people in America have shivers running down their spines at the thought of the Federal Government, which now wants to track every transaction if they make more than $10,000 a year, to track all their transactions with 83,000 new IRS agents. Again, maybe to some that is called infrastructure, but to most people, it is called a nightmare right before Halloween.

Why don't we bring bills to the floor to address these crises? If these aren't the bills that the majority likes, let's work on some other ones. All of these would address these problems, and many of them would get us back to the point where we were, where we had a secure border, where we had energy dominance, where we had jobs being created.

Each of these last few months you have seen jobs created dramatically lower than what the projections were because there are all of these self-created crises by the administration that are making it harder on hardworking families. It is the lowest income families that are being hit the hardest by these failed policies and all the Big Government socialist spending coming out of Washington. We don't need more. We need to actually go and confront the problem that is creating a debt crisis and all the other crises that families are facing.

It is not going to be by spending more money and taxing people more. It is going to be by working to address each of them, starting at the root of the problem and what created them. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I can respond, nor do I intend to respond, to each one of those assertions. I noticed that the gentleman totally ignored the facts.

The presentation the gentleman made, Madam Speaker, was as if the Republican policies were in place, we would be in high cotton.

Let me remind the gentleman, Donald Trump was President; the Republicans were in the majority, Madam Speaker; and over those 4 years, we lost a net 2.876 million people from jobs. The last 12 months of the Trump administration, 9,416,000 jobs were lost. Let me remind you, the best year you had, you had 2,820,000 new jobs. That is about an average of 235,000 jobs a month. Last month, when we were all wringing our hands because it came down substantially from expectations, it was 233,000.

In other words, the wringing of the hands over the poor job performance you seem to reflect was the average of Mr. Trump's best year. In fact, under this administration, helped by a bill, the American Rescue Plan, that every Republican voted against—what was the difference between the first five bills that were passed and the bill of 2021 that every Republican voted against? Donald Trump was President, and then Joe Biden was President.

It is like the debt limit, Madam Speaker. They know the debt limit has to be raised, or all the things that the gentleman just referenced are going to be hurt very, very badly.

Before you start criticizing people for not doing things to help, why don't you stop hurting the ability of the United States to present a balanced fiscal posture to our own economy and to the rest of the world and have some certitude that America is going to remain fiscally responsible and viable and pay its bills? I don't know the answer to that question. Perhaps, Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana knows.

□ 1200

The gentleman from Louisiana comes from a very important and critical energy producing State of our Nation. I don't blame him for being concerned about energy. He ought to be. We all ought to be. But, very frankly, we ought to also be very concerned about global warming, which the national security apparatus of the United States of America, even during the Trump administration, said was one of the biggest existential threats to the welfare of our people and the global community.

So, yes, we are very concerned about reaching an environment which is not dangerous for life on this planet. That is a very big issue for us. My friend is right, and we are going to deal with that in the Build Back Better plan. We are dealing with it, and we are dealing with it in the BIP plan.

Now, the BIP plan is a plan to spend $1.2 trillion on infrastructure investment over the next 10 years which will make our country more competitive, will increase our ability to produce goods here in America, Make It in America, which will make us more independent and self-sufficient. We found during the pandemic we weren't as self-sufficient as we should be and wanted to be.

These bills that we are considering will do that.

I don't expect many Republicans to vote for it. Even the transportation bill that I think they ought to be for—Donald Trump said he was going to spend $1 trillion, have a $1 trillion infrastructure program during his campaign, and then we went down to the White House, we had a meeting with him, and he said: No, $1 trillion is not enough, we ought to do $2 trillion.

He did zero, Madam Speaker, zero when the Republicans were in charge. Zero.

We are going to pass this infrastructure bill, and it is going to make a real difference. It is going to make a real difference on jobs, it is going to make a real difference on inflation, and it is going to make a real difference because we can increase the supply chain. It is going to make a real difference on the health of our globe.

So I tell the gentleman that he raises a lot of issues, and I would hope his party would start returning to a sense of bipartisanship in dealing with legitimate problems that the gentleman raises which we did in 2020.

Now, we did. We were in the minority. We voted with President Trump. Actually, we were in the majority, but President Trump was President, and we helped support his and the Treasury Secretary's objectives and our own objectives, and we came to an agreement, a bipartisan agreement.

Very frankly, it is unbelievable to me, Madam Speaker, that in the debt limit the minority leader of the United States Senate—and, very frankly, the gentleman just said that we all understand we don't want to—I presume he doesn't believe we ought to not raise our debt limit. I believe he wants us to pay our bills because he knows the catastrophic impact if we don't. But I don't understand why they won't support this. That is not an issue of Democrat or Republican. We all created that debt in one form or another. Certainly, last year we did a big number because we thought we needed to meet the pandemic. We did, and we saved millions of jobs in the process.

So my friend has these bills, we have bills, we are prepared to talk about proposals, as I have told my friend in the past. But, very frankly, there needs to be on some issues—that ought not to be political at all, like the debt limit—a statement that we are loyal to our country, not to Democrats. I said this the other day to the gentleman, the loyal opposition, not to Democrats, not to me as the majority leader, not to any of us, but to the country.

I would implore my friend, because we are going to have to do the debt, we are going to have to do the omnibus, we are going to have to do the debt limit, we want to do Build Back Better, and we want to do the infrastructure bill, those are four pieces of big legislation we want to do before December 30, I am hopeful that we can get some cooperation from the Republicans.

I mentioned the debt limit because that is an issue that the gentleman came to us under the Trump administration and asked us to help with. We knew it was critical for the interests of the country, and on three different occasions we voted with the President at the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trump administration's request and voted to make sure that America did not default on its bills.

Can I ask if the gentleman will at least, Madam Speaker, indicate that

they will support making sure that America continues to pay its bills?

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I sure hope that the gentleman is concerned not just about making sure the credit card bill is paid but making sure that the spending that maxed out the credit card is being done responsibly.

There are some key facts the gentleman left out in his conversation about how we got here. We got here because in January, one party, the Democratic Party—who is in the majority in the House, is in the majority in the Senate, and has control in the White House—made a decision—I don't agree with the decision—but made a decision that they were going to go it alone on the spending side. They decided that they were going to go max out the credit card. We urged them not to do it. We still to this day are urging not to go and just spend trillions and trillions more dollars.

If my friend wants to work with us on what the responsible decision should be, we are right here. We have been here from the beginning.

Madam Speaker, do you know, to this day President Biden has not met—we are in October, late October. President Biden has not met with the House Republican leadership on any of these issues—any of them.

The gentleman referenced a number of opportunities where it was described we were there to help President Trump. The majority wasn't just there to help President Trump, the majority was in the meetings when the decisions were being made.

The Paycheck Protection Program was not a partisan exercise. In fact, it was one of the most successful bipartisan exercises I have seen Congress come together and do. Everybody was in the room making those decisions. They were all very important decisions and big decisions that involved a lot of money, and we all made those decisions together. We all voted for those bills together, and then, ultimately, the spending that went along with it, the debt that went along with it was part of that negotiation and we voted for it together.

There has not been a decision made this year where the majority has negotiated with the minority to figure out if we could come to an agreement, so the majority did it on their own and look, the majority had the votes to do it.

But when the majority maxes out the credit card on their own, don't come and chide our side and say: Well, you need to be there to pay the bill when we weren't included in the decision to max out the credit card. And now that the credit card is maxed out, it is not as if there is an effort to slow down, in fact, it seems like it is full steam ahead, damn the torpedoes, spend trillions of dollars more on additional things like, again, 83,000 more IRS agents.

Madam Speaker, do you think anybody on this side supports that?

That is not something we support. It will rack up more debt, by the way. We don't support it, but I guess the gentleman expects we should pay for it even if we don't support it. Maybe if there was a negotiation where both sides were part of it.

SAM GRAVES, who is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has not been included in any of these decisions on infrastructure. Yet, I am sure the gentleman would expect him to vote for whatever comes out of a partisan exercise. That is not how things work, and I know the gentleman knows that.

Again, if the President wants to work with us—

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman continues to say facts that are not true.

Mr. SCALISE. Of course, those are true.

Mr. HOYER. They are not true.

Mr. SCALISE. We all negotiated on the three different debt ceiling increases that happened under the Trump administration, including CARES and the Paycheck Protection Program. They were very bipartisan.

Does the gentleman disagree with that?

Mr. HOYER. I do not disagree with it.

Mr. SCALISE. Those are the facts. And so when the gentleman looked at those facts, the gentleman talked about jobs and COVID. Before COVID happened, we had the hottest economy maybe in the history of our country. Wages were up for every demographic group. Those are facts. The gentleman saw small businesses up and women-owned small businesses were up over 20 percent. African-American unemployment was at its lowest level, Hispanic unemployment was at its lowest level, and then COVID came along.

Maybe there is a reason why the majority won't hold a hearing on the origin of COVID, but if the gentleman wants to just say because of COVID all of that is Donald Trump's fault, clearly the economy shut down, and we worked to get it back going again, and it is coming back. Frankly, some of the efforts to pay people not to work—and it is not just enhanced unemployment, it is a whole list of things—are hurting the recovery.

But those things were happening before COVID hit a year and a half ago, and it was because of good, sound policies that got us a secure border and that got us energy dominance, and, frankly, it was things like that that helped us get the economy going again because it was creating good jobs.

Keystone pipeline was moving forward. Those are good union jobs, by the way, and that was ended by President Biden unilaterally. He never even tried to have a meeting and a conversation with us to see if we could come to an agreement.

Again, I guess it is the prerogative of the majority. If the gentleman is in the majority, then the majority doesn't have to talk to the minority. But just because the majority didn't talk to the minority and they made decisions on their own about what they wanted to do, they didn't try to reach an agreement with us, to come to us after the fact when the majority has spent trillions of dollars, it has wreaked havoc through our economy, it has led to inflation we haven't seen in generations and gas prices we haven't seen in decades, then the majority wants to come and not ask us how to fix it—we have got ideas on how to fix it—the majority asks us to pay the bill.

Why don't we work together on the front end and not rack up trillions more in spending?

Because the things the gentleman talked about would rack up trillions more in spending which created these problems, and we were not a part of those conversations. I wish we were a part of the conversations and it was done in a bipartisan way. But, again, President Biden, 10 months into his administration, has yet to sit down and meet with House Republican leadership to talk about any of these ideas and solutions we could come up with together which is how it should be done.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

The reason I said he was misstating the facts is we have a bipartisan bill. It wasn't done by the Democratic leadership. It, frankly, wasn't done by the Republican leadership. It was done by Members of the United States Senate on the Republican side and on the Democratic side.

That bill was sent over here with almost half of the Republicans in the United States Senate voting for it, and my friend's leadership is lobbying against that infrastructure bill which would help all the issues the gentleman raised.

My friend is urging a ''no'' vote on that, and he is threatening Members who are going to vote for it—maybe not very many—because they know it is a bipartisan bill.

Mr. SCALISE. No one is being threatened.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the whip is talking about bipartisanship. There has been so little bipartisanship, and when there is bipartisanship, their Members are disciplined. When there is bipartisanship on saying that it wasn't a protest, it was an insurrection, there was no bipartisanship on that.

It was a: ''We don't care what it was. We don't care that some people were killed. We don't really care that they were trying to stop the counting of votes for the President of the United States of America. It was just a protest.''

That is what former President Trump said the other day. What a bunch of hooey. There clearly has been a conscious decision made by the leadership on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, against a bill that had 69 votes in the United States Senate. We only have 50.

And it is being lobbied against. Why? To hurt Joe Biden.

Yes, they voted, Madam Speaker, for the five bills.

Why?

Because ultimately Donald Trump was for them. Not everybody voted for them, but the majority. And as I said, CARES, $2 trillion, absolutely essential, was passed. But the gentleman refuses to answer the question except to say: Well, the credit card was maxed out.

The credit card was maxed out by date in a couple of those votes which we helped as the responsible opposition, as we did with John Boehner and Paul Ryan when they couldn't get votes to pass bills to keep government open or to keep the United States from defaulting. Yes, we cast the responsible vote.

It is not a popular vote because it is demagogued, Madam Speaker. It has nothing to do with the debt. The debt happens when you pass spending or pass revenue cuts. That is what affects the debt, and that is what all of us do one way or the other.

So we are all responsible and we ought to all be responsible. But the Senate leader on the Republican side of the aisle has said he is not going to do anything.

Not only will he not do anything, Madam Speaker, he will not allow the majority to do it on their own because he is going to filibuster so it requires 60 votes. We don't have 60 votes. We have 51.

□ 1215

Not only will they not do the responsible thing on debt, which would adversely affect, if we do not extend it, all the things that the minority whip lamented were wrong; it would all be adversely affected if, for the first time in history, Madam Speaker, we fail to extend the debt limit, which, by the way, very few countries have—one or two—because it is a phony issue. The debt is not phony, but the limit is controlled by what budgets we pass, what tax cuts we pass, what policies we pass.

Once we do that, we go in the store, or as JIM MCGOVERN, the chair of the Rules Committee said, we go in the restaurant and buy the steak. You need to pay for the steak. The argument, Madam Speaker, of, oh, well, you are proposing a lot of spending in the future, is totally unrelated. The debt limit is caused by the debt that we already incurred. The two bills that we had, they don't affect the debt limit. We have met it now, not when we passed these bills, not after we make that commitment.

We have a debt limit coming up now on December 3, which was totally irresponsible in and of itself, for political reasons only, coterminous with the funding of government. In 2019, when we took over, the government was shut down. We spent a lot of time opening it up. That hurt the economy. That hurt jobs. Now, at that point in time, it didn't hurt inflation. And I have been amazed over the years, over the last 10 years, that we haven't had more inflation for a number of reasons.

But he didn't answer the question, whether he would help on that. That is not for us. It is not for Democrats, not for Republicans. It is for our country. It is for our economy. It is for global fiscal stability.

So I would hope at least in that area—not for us. I am not asking you to do it for me, Madam Speaker. I am not asking anybody to do it for me or for my party or for the President of the United States. MITCH MCCONNELL says it is the country and the global community that could not afford default, and that is true.

Let me tell you, I think that is the first step to showing bipartisan responsibility together; not for one another, but for our country, Madam Speaker. And I hope that at some point in time we can show that kind of good faith.

I included this morning the remarks that President George W. Bush made in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, on the kind of America that he wanted to see. I would hope all of my Republican colleagues would read what George W. Bush had to say. It is so different from the rhetoric of the current leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, in terms of bringing us together as a country.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to answer the question. It might not be the answer the gentleman wants, but I would be happy to be part of an actual bipartisan negotiation on how to solve our country's debt. That has not happened.

But if you look at the bill that the gentleman brought to this floor to deal with the debt over a month ago, it absolutely dealt with spending, not that already happened, but that will happen in the future, including the trillions of dollars of debt-laden bills that spend more money in Washington.

It picked a date, and the date that the gentleman put in the bill that was brought to this House floor was December 31, 2022. That is not spending we have already done. That is spending that the majority plans to do in a very partisan way, not just through this year but through all of next year.

When we are not even included in those decisions, then you come and say, well, you should just be expected to pay for whatever we want to spend, trillions more, between now and the end of a year, over a year from now, that is not a negotiation. That is not even an attempt to want to work with the other side.

Now, again, the gentleman is in the majority. In the Senate, they are in the majority, and the gentleman very well knows that both sides have the ability, if you want to do the spending on your own, to address the debt that would be created by all of that spending on your own. It doesn't take 60 votes. The gentleman is well aware that there is a legislative instrument that if all the spending wants to be done in a partisan way—and I am talking about the trillions that are still laying in front of us that the gentleman said may come to the floor next week, not necessarily will, might come to the floor, might come to the floor a month from now, might come to the floor a year from now. And we won't even be included in those negotiations, but we ought to be expected to vote for the debt that would be racked up by it?

If the other side were being asked to do that, you know your majority wouldn't go for that. But we wouldn't do it. We would at least include you in a negotiation. If we didn't want to, then we would be responsible for doing it on our own if we did the spending on our own. And the tools are there to do just that.

Threatening to default on the Nation's debt when legislative instruments are included in this majority to not have default is irresponsible. That threat keeps being thrown out there by the majority, even though the majority knows they could, with a majority vote in the House and a majority vote in the Senate, address the debt that wants to be racked up between now and next December.

Again, I would urge that all of that new spending doesn't happen, that we come together and negotiate what budget limits should be like we have done in the past under Republican and Democrat Presidents. Those were bipartisan deals. There has been no bipartisan attempt to do that this year.

Why is there opposition to infrastructure? Well, first of all, if there was a desire to do bipartisan infrastructure, you are going to find a lot of takers over here. I know the gentleman made an assertion—probably not realizing it—but there would have been no threats, no threats made on our side of the aisle on a bill.

Now, I see people being followed into bathrooms on the other side and all kinds of other things being done. There are no threats on this side. What we said is, we want an infrastructure negotiation. But the day that the deal was reached in the Senate with the President, he turned around about an hour later and undermined that deal by tying it, linking it, to the tax-and-spend bill.

That is when it became a problem because taxing and spending trillions more dollars would be a problem to this country. It would hurt middle-class families and lower income families to have that natural gas tax, to have all the additional inflation on top of the inflation they already see. It became a problem for all of those reasons, that package, not the individual bill.

As the President himself has said multiple times, as the Speaker herself has said multiple times, it is not a standalone bill. It is not two standalone bills. It is a package. They are married together at the hip.

That is where the opposition comes from. By the way, there is a really

good bipartisan infrastructure bill that is out there. S. 3011 came over from the Senate unanimously. $500 billion of infrastructure is authorized in this bill. If the gentleman would bring this up for a vote, it would probably fly overwhelmingly. It would allow for, again, about $500 billion immediately that could be spent on infrastructure all across this country, plus an additional large sum next year—maybe $100 billion next year—on top of the $500 billion.

It just passed out of the Senate unanimously; every Republican, every Democrat supported this bill. This is real infrastructure. This is not tied to some tax-and-spend bill that maybe the gentleman might think is a good idea. We surely don't. We know how damaging it would be to our country and to our economy and to middle and lower income families.

This is a very bipartisan bill that could be bipartisan here, where we could be a part of a negotiation on something really good, where States wouldn't have to wait months. They have the money ready to go today. This gives them the flexibility to make their own decisions on what is best for the infrastructure in each of these States.

Maryland would be able to control their own destiny on over $1 billion. Louisiana would be able to control their own destiny on over $1 billion today if this bill passed.

So, absolutely, we support real infrastructure. If it is tied together and married to something that would be devastating to the economy, of course not. Maybe if the majority would look at delinking those two and abandoning the bill that would raise taxes—and even internally in the Democrat Caucus those discussions have been going on. That is not just Republicans asking for that. There are a number of Democrats asking for that, too. That would be a bipartisan initiative to say we are jettisoning this idea that we are going to raise hundreds of billions, if not multiple trillions—whatever the number—if it is $1 trillion, $5 trillion it would be devastating to our economy and middle-class families.

Let's abandon that and go work on something that would actually be real infrastructure that we could all rally behind. It would pass overwhelmingly. It would be good for the country. President Biden would get to sign it into law. We would support that.

I ask the gentleman to look at S. 3011, and if he is not a supporter of that plan that passed with 100 Senators, maybe there is a better idea. But this one is a really good one that got every Republican and every Democrat in the Senate earlier this week to say yes. We would be happy to say yes to it as well if we are given that opportunity. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think that bill passed the Senate Wednesday, so we will look at it, but we haven't had a chance to look at it at this point in time.

I want to get back—and I know this sounds like a broken record on the debt limit, but the gentleman makes the point, Madam Speaker, that somehow we have raised the debt to accommodate spending. That is what you always do because if you reach the debt limit, you are done. You stop Social Security. You stop veterans' payments. You stop any support payments. You stop paying the armed services of the United States. That is the spending you stop when you can no longer incur debt. Why? Because we spent a lot of money. We put it on the credit card, and it is coming due. It comes due on a regular basis, and we have to pay it on a regular basis.

The gentleman has voted for bills that do exactly what the bill he lamented, and none of his colleagues voted for, Madam Speaker, exactly what he asked us to do, extend it by a date, not a number, by a date. Then he hypothesizes, well, in that timeframe, you are going to incur additional expenses. He is absolutely right.

So, he is lamenting and giving as a reason for his not voting for it is because there are some proposals to spend money in the future. There are lots of them from all sides.

Then he brings up this ''tied together.'' Let me tell you who has tied it together. The Republican leadership has tied these together. Yes, the President talked about it. He said, no, they are not tied together. He said, first of all, they are tied together, and then he said, no, I negotiated this bill; don't do it.

But I will tell the gentleman, as the majority leader who brings bills to the floor, their infrastructure bill passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan vote and put together in a bipartisan vote Republicans, Democrats, and the President of the United States.

Now, he is the President of the United States. I know the gentleman voted against certifying his election in a bipartisan move, I suppose.

But, Madam Speaker, that bill will be brought up separately, and you vote for that bill on its merits and vote against it on its merits. Do not hide behind the fact that you don't like some other bill.

Donald Trump said he was going to do a trillion dollars on infrastructure to help our economy. He didn't do it. Then he said it was going to be $2 trillion. He didn't do it. Republicans were in the majority. They controlled the House and the Senate. They didn't do it.

We have a bill they can vote for. I would urge them to vote for extending the debt limit so our country meets its full faith and credit obligations and for the infrastructure bill because I think it is a bipartisan bill negotiated by Republicans, by Democrats, and by the President of the United States which will help our economy and, as I said and will reiterate, every issue that the gentleman raised, Madam Speaker, in his opening remarks.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his comments.

There is clearly a bipartisan bill on infrastructure that we would be happy to support, S. 3011. Nobody in the House on the Republican side was included in any of those negotiations, including the ranking member of the Transportation Committee who he himself has been urging a large bill. $450 billion was put on the table, which, by the way, if that were passed, it would be the largest infrastructure bill in the history of the United States. He was pushed out of the negotiations.

Again, the majority has that ability because they are in the majority, but they surely never tried a bipartisan negotiation, as well the gentleman knows, on those prior budget agreements.

It wasn't just voted for or against because of who was in the White House. It was voted for by both parties because the negotiation on what that spending limit was was agreed upon by the leadership of both sides.

Mr. HOYER. That is not accurate, and you know it.

Mr. SCALISE. The House, Senate, Republican, Democrat, we came to agreement on those budgets, and that is why the gentleman voted for it. That is why I voted for it, because it was a negotiated agreement. There was give and take on a number of items but ultimately agreed by a date certain but under a budget agreement.

□ 1230

There is a date certain of December 31 of 2022 that has no bipartisan agreement. We know what a lot of the spending will be, because trillions have already been spent that we were not included in and we strongly opposed. The gentleman knew that when he brought the bills to the floor, but he wanted to bring them to the floor anyway because you had the votes. I get it. That is the way majorities work.

But if you decide to exclude one party from negotiations and go spend the money anyway and then have a whole list of trillions more in spending down the road and include that in a bill, I don't really think anybody expects the people who were pushed to the curb to vote for the credit card limit being increased with all the spending that is going to continue to be racked up—not that has already been racked up—that will be racked up between now and December 31 of 2022 is going to be done in a partisan way. That is what the record has been so far this year on the trillions that have already been added by bills passed by this majority. They weren't bipartisan. Again, that is the prerogative of the majority.

We have stood here ready. We have listed bill after bill to address crisis after crisis, none of which have been brought to the floor. We are still ready to go to solve these problems. We have

talked about a bipartisan bill on infrastructure that we can support. Ultimately, the majority makes that decision.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, if this Congress had never met this year, we would have to extend the debt limit at some point in time this year. That is a fact.

Mr. MCCONNELL has said it is inconceivable that we would not extend the debt limit of the United States of America and fail our obligation under full faith and credit. As a matter of fact, the Constitution, in the 14th Amendment, says it shall not be questioned, but we have to take some legislative action.

The issue is what is our responsibility to the United States of America, not all this argument that pretends that somehow some bills that are proposed on spending or some that may have been passed this year, if they hadn't been passed, somehow we wouldn't have to do this. If anybody on either side of the aisle believes that to be the case, they ought to be defeated by their constituents because they don't know what is going on here, on either side of the aisle.

This is a very serious issue with respect to jobs, infrastructure, inflation, healthcare, and environment. All of those will be adversely affected, and the global community itself, if we do not extend this debt. We can argue about the other issues, but there is no argument about this issue.

Every Republican President has asked that this be done. Every Republican Secretary of the Treasury, since I have been in this Congress, 41 years, has asked that we extend the debt limit; every one of them, without fail. Every one of them has said—President Reagan on—that if we did not do it, the country's economy, reputation, and well-being would be put disastrously at risk.

I don't want bipartisanship. I want patriotism. I want people committed to their country and their country's well-being to stand up and say: I am not going to demagogue an issue that is so critically important to the welfare of my Nation.

I say to the gentleman again: Exactly what they passed when they were in the majority, and we voted for it, setting a future date—not a number, a future date. Exactly. We didn't ask them to do anything more than we did.

In terms of bipartisanship, I will again say: You have got a bipartisan bill negotiated in a bipartisan way that will be coming to this floor at some point in time, I hope earlier rather than later, separately—not tied to I don't like this bill, I don't like that bill, I won't do this, I won't do that, I won't do the other—which will substantially grow jobs in our country and deal with the climate crisis in our country.

I would ask you to support both of those propositions when they come to the floor in a show of bipartisan support for our country, not for each other, but for our country.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we need to do this in a bipartisan way, which hasn't happened. But partisanship is not patriotism, and we have seen a lot of partisanship.

I have served in leadership under three different Presidents now. When we had to negotiate how to come together on the priorities of our government, how to properly fund things and deal with our debt, under President Obama, we had those bipartisan meetings in the White House. When President Trump came in, we had those bipartisan meetings in the White House. Still to this day, late October, 10 months into his Presidency, there has not been a single time where President Biden has brought a bipartisan group of our leadership together.

I understand he has met with Democrat leadership many times in the White House. Again, that is his prerogative. He is the President; you are in the majority. If you want to do all of this in a partisan way, I don't suggest it is healthy and I don't suggest it is the right way. Every President I have served under in leadership has had bipartisan meetings to have these conversations and come to an agreement. That has not happened under this President.

He ought to go and live by the words that he promised during the campaign, that he would work with both parties in a bipartisan way. To not have met with House Republican leadership once during his Presidency, 10 months in, is not an acceptable way to run this government.

Then all of a sudden, things end up partisan, and everybody throws their hands up and goes: How did this happen? Just reach out. He is the President of the United States. If he says let's go tomorrow, we will be there tomorrow. But he won't do that. We have asked for meetings. At some point they have to have them.

Again, if he doesn't want them to happen, that is his prerogative, because the same party controls all levers of government. But if the same party controls all levers of government and wants to just toss aside the other party in either Chamber—oh, we worked with Senators. Even some of those Senators that were mentioned are not supporting what is happening with debt, because there has been no negotiation with both parties on the debt, on the spending that gets us to the debt. So there can be proposals for trillions more in spending. If we oppose it, we have been very clear why we have that opposition.

It wasn't us that married those bills together. President Biden came here just two weeks ago. They said he was going to be closing the deal. He was going to be the closer. We were going to have a vote on the House floor. The Speaker promised there would be a vote on the House floor.

Instead, at that meeting, it has been reported that he said the two bills are tied together. Since then, he said: I want both of them coming to me. He has tied them together. I wish he wouldn't. That is the President's prerogative. He has made it very clear. The Speaker has made it very clear. It has not been our side that has done that. We want to separate those as a package, but they have been kept together as a package. Until then, at least we have been looking for other opportunities, and we found one in S. 3011 that passed the Senate unanimously. That would be $500 billion in real infrastructure today. Every Governor of every State would have the ability to start doing $500 billion in new infrastructure projects. We think that would be really good for our country. We support it. We are ready to negotiate.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this needs to come to an end, obviously, but I will tell you this, as I stand here, as somebody who sat on this floor on January 6 and the question was would the House perform its function of accepting the electoral college vote to elect this President—it wasn't that there hadn't been voices in the past who had raised questions. But there was no effort by Ms. Clinton, who received the majority of the votes, or Mr. Gore, who received the majority of the votes, to raise a question about the legitimacy of the election.

But we had an insurrection incited by, invited by, and deployed by the President of the United States. So we didn't start on a very good bipartisan basis, again, not because Republicans should have been happy that their candidate was not elected or any more than we were happy that our candidate was not elected in the Clinton and Gore campaigns.

It was, at least, that we ought to uphold the constitutional principles. Vice President Pence did, and there were people in this Capitol on that night who wanted to see him, apparently, eliminated. That wasn't a good bipartisan start, Madam Speaker. The majority of Republicans voted against certifying the electoral college results in State after State. But we ought to put that behind us. That is done. What we are doing now is we are acting on behalf of the country.

The two issues that I dwelt on, because I think we have agreement on that, rhetorically and intellectually but not electorally, not in terms of voting, is the debt limit should never be breached and that we need to invest in infrastructure, two simple propositions.

The Senate minority leader says: We should never breach the full faith and credit of the United States of America, but I won't help you do it. I don't get that. Frankly, it seems to be kind of irrational.

And then an infrastructure bill passed overwhelmingly by the United

States Senate, which we are putting on the floor unchanged, as it was, not coupled—as it is and was—and saying let's vote for that.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we stand ready to work, if there is bipartisan efforts made. We will see if that develops.

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

REMEMBERING SUMMER BARROW

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on the House floor about Summer Barrow.

Summer was born on July 4 and was named for the season. Her mother, Carey Colvin, said that Summer was a firecracker, she was vivacious, she loved to dance, she loved to sing, and she loved music. But Summer died of a fentanyl overdose in January of 2020.

Summer's substance use disorder began after she was prescribed oxycodone after a car accident, and when the prescription ran out, she turned to heroin.

This vibrant young woman lost her life to a substance use disorder, and amid her loss, her mother, Carey, has turned to advocacy.

In her honor, I was proud to introduce the bipartisan Support Recovery for Addiction Act, legislation that would create a guaranteed funding stream for recovery support services and community organizations.

Of her daughter, Carey said: ''I know what she would want to say is: 'Please get help.'''

This bill would help deliver that help to others, just as Summer and so many others that we have lost to substance use disorder would have wanted.

□ 1245

RESTORE THE HYDE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, there comes a time to dispel the myth that we must choose between women's rights and children's rights. Now is the time because we can protect both.

Sadly, abortion reveals society's inability to love, to protect, and to care for the most innocent and helpless among us.

When we devalue life, our society suffers. When we deem some to be nonessential, we devalue their lives.

I am strongly pro-life, and I consistently stand up for the rights of the unborn and the born.

Our society is willing to and does care for the mother in need. Perhaps she is scared and alone. Americans across the country reach out to help mothers and the children that they are nourishing in their wombs.

I must rise today to express my grave concern that our Democrat colleagues' proposed spending bill lacks crucial protections that ensure that taxpayer funds do not pay for abortions.

Without this protection, taxpayer-funded abortions not only harm us as a society but violate the religious freedoms of thousands of Americans.

The longstanding, bipartisan Hyde amendment ensures just that, that taxpayer funds do not go toward abortion. However, the Democrats' currently proposed multitrillion-dollar build back broke plan does not contain those lifesaving protections.

In 1994, then-Senator Joe Biden wrote, ''Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.''

In God we trust.

CHILD TAX CREDIT PROVIDES CRITICAL SUPPORT TO FAMILIES

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, 7 months ago, Democrats passed a historic tax cut for middle-class families and lifted millions of children out of poverty.

Since then, some of my conservative colleagues have had the audacity to complain that we helped too many children.

In my district, here is what it means when 97 percent of families are eligible for the child tax credit:

For Yvette, it means healthy food on the table.

For Sara, it means being able to afford her child's preschool tuition.

This money goes straight into our local economy, helping parents get back to work and build the future that their children deserve.

But without a clean extension of the child tax credit, American families will lose this critical support just as the economy begins to recover.

This tax credit isn't a handout. It is about putting hard-earned tax dollars back in the pockets of working families with children.

For any of my colleagues who won't vote to help their constituents, let me be clear: I will vote for the families in your districts and mine because our children deserve nothing less.

CONGRATULATING ADMIRAL FALLER ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the storied career of Admiral Craig Faller, commander of the U.S. Southern Command.

Admiral Faller is a native of Fryburg, Pennsylvania, a small town located in Clarion County, in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

His naval career started in 1983, following his graduation from the U.S. Naval Academy with a degree in systems engineering. From there, he went on to serve during the Gulf war.

During his service, Admiral Faller has held a variety of posts and positions, from supporting the United Nations' sanctions against Iraq and the humanitarian efforts following the devastating tsunami off Indonesia to supporting Operations New Dawn and Enduring Freedom. His service took him all over the world.

Regardless of location, either on the sea or shore, Admiral Faller consistently provided leadership and guidance.

Admiral Faller currently serves as commander of the U.S. Southern Command and will be retiring from the Navy at the end of this month.

Admiral Faller, thank you for your service to the United States of America. Your dedication to our country is admirable. Enjoy your retirement. You deserve it.

MAKING AMERICA THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it gives me great joy when I can come to the floor and really speak directly to the moms and dads and families that right now, as we stand on the floor, are probably looking to gather children from schools, looking at what they are going to do over the weekend, maybe doing grocery shopping and looking at the resources that they do have or do not have.

It is important that we immediately pass the Build Back Better Act and that those who have a difference of opinion realize that it is always the greater good that America has always been about. When we have gone to war, we have not gone to war to be an offender. We have gone to war to defend principles of democracy.

I believe the Build Back Better Act will provide greater pricing of prescription drugs, strengthening the Affordable Care Act, expanding Medicaid for some 12 States. The State of Texas happens to be one of them, where 733,000-plus people are uninsured. These are working people. Expanding Federal Medicaid is going to help those people in States like Kansas and South Dakota. If they won't speak for themselves, I will speak for America.

In addition, the care economy really says that we must give childcare and universal kindergarten to people so that we can be advanced and our people can be helped.

Finally, let me say that voting is important and crucial. We must pass voting rights.

This is Build Back Better America, and build back makes America the best country in the world.