

Kim (CA)	Moore (AL)	Smith (NJ)
Kinzinger	Moore (UT)	Smucker
Kustoff	Mullin	Spartz
LaHood	Murphy (NC)	Stauber
LaMalfa	Nehls	Steel
Lamborn	Newhouse	Stefanik
Latta	Norman	Steil
LaTurner	Oberholte	Steube
Lesko	Owens	Stewart
Letlow	Palazzo	Taylor
Long	Pence	Tenney
Loudermilk	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Lucas	Pfuger	Tiffany
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Timmons
Mace	Reed	Turner
Malliotakis	Reschenthaler	Upton
Mann	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Massie	Rodgers (WA)	Van Drew
Mast	Rogers (KY)	Van Dune
McCarthy	Rose	Wagner
McCaul	Rosendale	Walberg
McClain	Rouzer	Walorski
McHenry	Roy	Waltz
McKinley	Salazar	Weber (TX)
Meijer	Scalise	Wenstrup
Meuser	Schweikert	Westerman
Miller (IL)	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Miller (WV)	Sessions	Wittman
Miller-Meeks	Simpson	Womack
Moolenaar	Smith (MO)	Young
Mooney	Smith (NE)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Cartwright	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Cline	Palmer	Williams (TX)
Green (TN)	Rogers (AL)	
Higgins (LA)	Rutherford	

□ 1125

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 9.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 9.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)	DeGette (Blunt)	Kim (NJ)
Auchincloss	Rochester	(Pallone)
(Clark (MA))	DelBene (Kilmer)	Kind (Connolly)
Barragan (Beyer)	DeSaulnier	Kinzinger
Bass (Cicilline)	(Beyer)	(Meijer)
Bera (Kilmer)	Doggett (Raskin)	Kirkpatrick
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	(Pallone)
(Beyer)	F. (Connolly)	Lamborn
Bonamici	Evans (Mfume)	(McHenry)
(Kuster)	Frankel, Lois	Langevin
Boyle, Brendan	(Clark (MA))	(Lynch)
F. (Gallego)	Gaetz (Boebert)	Lawson (FL)
Brooks (Moore)	Garamendi	(Soto)
(AL)	(Sherman)	Lee (CA)
Brownley	Gohmert (Weber	(Khanna)
(Kuster)	(TX))	Leger Fernandez
Bush (Bowman)	Gomez (Gallego)	(Clark (MA))
Cárdenas (Soto)	Gonzalez,	Lieu (Beyer)
Casten	Vicente	Loftgren (Jeffries)
(Underwood)	(Correa)	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Grijalva (Garcia	(Beyer)
(Soto)	(IL))	Mace (Timmons)
Chu (Clark (MA))	Hagedorn (Carl)	Maloney,
Cleaver (Davids	Herrera Beutler	Carolyn B.
(KS))	(Moore (UT))	(Wasserman
Cohen (Beyer)		Schultz)
Cooper (Clark	Hudson	Maloney, Sean
(MA))	(McHenry)	Patrick
Crawford	Jacobs (NY)	(Jeffries)
(Stewart)	(Garbarino)	McCaul (Ellzey)
Crenshaw	Jayapal (Raskin)	McEachin
(Sessions)	Johnson (TX)	(Wexton)
Crist (Soto)	(Jeffries)	Meng (Kuster)
Cuellar (Correa)	Kahele (Case)	Moore (WI)
DeFazio (Brown	Katko (Meijer)	(Beyer)
(MD))	Kim (CA) (Steel)	Moulton (Beyer)

Nadler (Pallone)	Reschenthaler	Suoizzi (Raskin)
Napolitano	(Armstrong)	Swalwell
(Correa)	Roybal-Allard	(Gallego)
Nehls (Babin)	(Correa)	Titus (Connolly)
Ocasio-Cortez	Ruiz (Aguilar)	Tlaib (Khanna)
(Bowman)	Ruppersberger	Torres (NY)
Panetta (Kildee)	(Trone)	(Cicilline)
Payne (Pallone)	Rush (Kaptur)	Vargas (Correa)
Pingree	Salazar (Mast)	Vela (Correa)
(Cicilline)	Schrier	Waltz (Mast)
Pocan (Raskin)	(Spanberger)	Waters (Takano)
Porter (Wexton)	Sires (Pallone)	Watson Coleman
Pressley (Garcia	Smucker (Keller)	(Pallone)
(IL))	Speier (Escobar)	Welch
Price (NC)	Stansbury	(McGovern)
(Connolly)	(Jacobs (CA))	Wilson (FL)
Reed (McHenry)	Stanton (Levin	(Cicilline)
	(CA))	

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 4394

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 4394, a bill originally introduced by Representative Nunes of California, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1130

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 my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SCALISE for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Tuesday 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 Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

And again, as usual, on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House, Madam Speaker, will consider Senate 2959, the Supplemental Impact Aid Flexibility Act under suspension of the rules. This bill passed the Senate unanimously. It is on suspension in the House. It is coauthored by Representative JOE COURTNEY of the House.

This bipartisan legislation allows local educational agencies participating in the Impact Aid Program to use the student count or Federal property valuation data from their fiscal year 2022 program applications for their fiscal year 2023 applications.

This, Madam Speaker, will prevent schools from losing substantial funding

upon which they have relied to address COVID-19 learning loss by giving them more flexibility to use pre-pandemic data to calculate funding needs.

The House may consider other bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will also consider H.R. 4673, the EVEST Act sponsored by Chairman MARK TAKANO of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the rule for which we adopted this week.

This legislation would automatically enroll eligible veterans into the VA healthcare system so that no veterans are left behind when it comes to receiving quality, affordable healthcare.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, the House stands ready to act on the Build Back Better Act, as well as the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act should the Senate amend them and send them back to us.

Additional legislative items, of course, are possible.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, on the school bill, I know one of the big concerns many people have been raising is trying to get schools open again.

Last week it was reported that 5,200 different schools were closed last week. And I know this Congress has sent billions of dollars to school systems across the country. The intent was that that money be used to get schools opened, and yet, there are some schools taking the money and staying closed, which goes against all the medical science out there. We know the damage this is doing to our young children, learning, depression, and so many other challenges that it creates for them.

Will there be any part of that legislation that helps require that in order to get money schools have to be open?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, because I don't have it in front of me, and I haven't read it as carefully as perhaps I should have, I don't know the specific answer to that question.

What I do want to say, however, is that we need to have kids in school. Everybody says that the learning experience is substantially compromised by virtual learning. It is better than nothing, and it has been pursued very vigorously and with great positive effect.

But having said that, we all think that young people ought to be back in schools. But I don't know whether this bill, which passed the Senate unanimously, deals with that particular aspect that the gentleman asked about. But let me say this: I think that every school system has adopted the premise that in school is better.

Clearly, we have been assaulted by a virus whose transmissibility is substantially more than the previous virus, the delta variant. The omicron variant, as we know, one of the problems is it is easily caught and easily transmitted.

The good news is if you have taken a vaccination and had a booster, the likelihood of you going to the hospital is much smaller, and if you go to the hospital, you are much less sick. But having said that, we continue to have a challenge to get this under control. And the administration, properly so, and the overwhelming majority of the medical community, properly so, and the overwhelming majority of scientists are recommending that we wear a mask, that we wear a KN95 or N95 mask because they are much better than the surgical masks or the cloth masks, that we continue to wash our hands regularly, and we continue to keep our distance.

But the gentleman and I agree that we need to ensure that—to the extent that it is possible and that parents will send their children to school because of being dissuaded by the transmissibility of this disease—we need to have kids in school.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. Maybe we can work on something that would ensure that as tax dollars are going to school systems that it is going to keep the schools open, not to allow them to then shut down on the kids because, as we know, the science is very clear that kids are much better off in school, safer in school than not being in school, and that the learning experience is dramatically less if they are not in school, as well as the mental conditions, the social development that is not occurring if they are not in the classroom.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think everybody is concerned about this. Certainly, every parent in my district and your district is concerned about this, and anybody who is concerned about the welfare of our children is concerned about it.

But I think it would be appropriate for me to say that the teachers of America—and my wife was a teacher, and I happen to believe that teachers are the most important people in any society because they educate the leadership and the citizens of tomorrow—have been put to an extraordinary challenge.

And I have a granddaughter who has four children, so I have four great-grandchildren, three of whom are in school and were in school in 2020 and 2021. And Judy, my granddaughter, who is named after my wife, has told me on numerous occasions what extraordinary ends her children's teachers—there were three different teachers at different levels in the school system—went to make sure that while they were home, while they were learning virtually that they had a positive, productive experience. But all of them felt, I think, it is a lot easier to have kids in school if they can do so safely. I think that bears saying.

Like medical personnel, teachers have been put through extraordinary

stress, as have parents generally have been put through stress.

So I think the gentleman's concern is rightfully placed, and we need to do everything we can to make sure kids get back in school and have a learning experience like you and I had in the classroom.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, our teachers have been true heroes through this, our frontline hospital workers, people that work at grocery stores; we have seen so many people rising up to the challenge, and even where governments failed their ability to do their job.

I know one challenge that, hopefully, we see resolved in the United States Supreme Court—it won't be today; we were expecting it maybe this week, but, hopefully, early next week we see the Supreme Court resolve these challenges where there were mandates on vaccines that required people to get fired from their job if they chose a healthcare decision on vaccinations.

I have been vaccinated. I know the gentleman from Maryland has too, but for those who haven't, whether they are frontline hospital workers or teachers, people shouldn't be forced to lose their job based on that choice they make. But the Supreme Court will, hopefully, address that and resolve that next week. It is something that is out of our hands now, but it is in the court's hands at the highest level.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I understand the gentleman's position, which is held by a number of people.

My own view is that employers make a reasonable decision when they say to an employee—for the sake, not only of the employee but for everybody else in the workplace with whom they work—that you are required to be vaccinated because we believe that science and medical personnel tell us that is a much safer route. But I understand there is a difference on that.

But even then, I know Governors who have been against vaccines are not necessarily against the employer requiring that as an employee requirement as opposed to a governmental requirement.

Mr. SCALISE. And I would hope the government would drop that mandate, but if not, it is hopeful that the Court would make it clear that the government doesn't have the authority to require that people get fired if they don't get vaccinated, encourage people to follow the science. If they have questions or concerns, that is a conversation they should have with their doctor, not a government mandate.

But as the gentleman knows, we may have disagreement on that, but fortunately for us, it will get resolved at the Supreme Court, hopefully, early next week.

I wanted to ask the gentleman since, we are looking at the schedule for next week, I didn't notice any of the bills that we have highlighted in the past that would address some of the many crises our country is facing, whether it is inflation, whether it is high gas

prices, whether it is the border crisis—all that are running out of control—the empty shelves that we are seeing at so many stores.

Will the gentleman commit to working with us to bring some of the bills to the floor to address the real crises that are hurting hardworking families like the ones I just mentioned?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, first of all, let me say inflation is a serious challenge confronting American families, particularly working families in this country.

I live alone, and because I am just one person, I buy relatively small amounts of food at the grocery store. And I go to the grocery store nowadays and whether it is the price of bacon, which is at \$12 a pound for Hormel or another meat packing, it is high, and I think to myself how a family not doing as well as I am doing and with kids to feed, how tough it is on them. So this inflation is very tough.

It is a worldwide phenomenon. It is a phenomenon that is caused obviously by a pent-up demand asking for a lot of goods and chasing a lot of goods. And elementary economics, that any of us took in college, is that there are a lot of resources chasing few resources, i.e., a lot of money chasing a short supply of goods, and you have that demand so that it drives prices up.

This pandemic has had a global effect on the supply chain. The supply chain has been substantially affected. This was not the fault of, frankly, either Biden or his predecessor in terms of what happened to the supply chain. In Singapore they shut down companies, as you know, for months at a time. They just shut them down, which is one of the things that has led to this chip shortage, which has had ramifications.

So I want to assure the gentleman that the administration, our side of the aisle—I know your side of the aisle is very concerned about the inflationary pressure that is putting such a stress on America's families. This pandemic has caused extraordinary, historic things to happen. That is the bad news.

The good news is we have created more jobs in the last year and 2 months than were created—of course, net we lost jobs for the previous 4 years; over 2 million jobs net lost. So the good news is that we have a number of economic statistics that are, in fact, positive. However, having said that, we do need to be very concerned about inflation. The administration has expressed their concern.

We believe that the infrastructure bill will have a positive impact on inflation, assuming the Build Back Better Act passes, which I assume at some point it will.

□ 1145

I think that is going to have a very positive affect on inflation because it will help the supply chain, help the

health of the people, the employees, it will make people more able to get out. Childcare. It is going to help people get back to work, which will have a positive impact on the supply chain and on the availability of goods and services. So I think we are moving in the right direction.

Unemployment, as the gentleman knows, which is down 3.9 percent. So while inflation is up and unacceptably high, historically high, over the last 4 years, we need to get it down. And we see this phenomena happening all over the world. This is not the fault of the President or the Congress, it is the fault of an extraordinary, invasive, and widespread disease that has caused extraordinary disruptions within our society and economy.

But we need to get a handle on it. We need to take action. So I will talk to the gentleman about what issues he believes would be helpful in that regard.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, some of those bills that have been discussed and offered up in the past to address the inflationary problems but also the policies of this administration that have caused that. And as we know from the energy crisis, it is not pandemic related that gas prices are so high. This President made a decision starting on day one of his administration to shut down American energy production, to shut down pipelines in America, green lighting pipelines in other countries, begging foreign countries to make more oil, but shutting off and making it harder to make energy in America.

Clearly, that self-imposed supply shortage has created higher prices that we would love to see addressed. We might disagree philosophically on how to get there, but I don't think there is much disagreement from people who spend over \$100 filling their car up that it needs to change. But if you look at the workforce challenges, and every small business owner I talk to—I would imagine all of us could share similar stories—our small business owners are telling us they can't find workers. Somebody might want to go to their favorite restaurant but they are waiting an hour and a half and wondering why a third of the tables are empty, because they can't get people to work.

And so as some might want to look at the unemployment number, clearly the number of people that are not even in the workforce that just stopped working because they can get paid, right now large amounts of money, to stay at home is a challenge that we should confront here in this Congress to help encourage people to get back into the workforce, not to be paying people not to work. And the enhanced unemployment benefits were, one, part of that problem, but there were many other parts of that problem.

But it is the idea that there are too many dollars, as the gentleman said, chasing too few goods is the driver of inflation, but the biggest driver of that is all of the money that has been spent in Washington. And if you look at

about \$6 trillion that has been spent on various relief packages—some of it was targeted to COVID, which we all supported, very bipartisan, some of it had nothing to do with COVID which, unfortunately, has created higher inflation—there is talk right now that the administration—and I am not sure if the Democratic leadership is having serious conversations on this—is looking at yet another bill, potentially over a trillion dollars of additional spending.

I would ask the gentleman, is that something that is anticipated to be brought to the floor? I would urge, if that is being looked at, to not do it because there is about \$800 billion remaining from other relief packages that are unspent. And hopefully we stop the spending in Washington that is driving inflation and try to encourage the economy to get opened at a more rapid pace. And if people need additional help, to look to the money that is sitting there, the \$800 billion that is unspent, rather than trillions more dollars that would be put into a marketplace that is already oversaturated with Federal spending that is driving this inflation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Of course, as you know better than probably anybody, the Speaker appointed a task force to look exactly at that issue of the \$800 billion and what has been done, what has been spent to make sure that it has been properly spent, because you are the ranking member on the committee headed up by JIM CLYBURN that is looking at those issues. I know you had a hearing this past week.

Yes, we have a difference of opinion. The difference of opinion, you call it spending, I call it investment. We are investing in our children. We are investing in our families. We are investing in small businesses. We are investing in growth and opportunity. And we are investing in the ability of those folks that you talk about that are not in the workforce, the restaurant can't hire. Why can't they hire them? Because they are not paying sufficient amount to justify a mom getting childcare because childcare is so expensive. Or she is caught—or a single dad—is caught in the catch-22 situation. If I go to work, I will earn money but I will pay it all to childcare. If I am going to pay it all to childcare, it is much better for me as a parent to be with my child, if the net result is going to be pretty much a wash.

We are investing in that. We are investing in childcare in the Build Back Better Act. We are investing in early childhood education, three- and four-year-olds. We believe that is investment. And it also is very important for that small business so that that mom or dad who has that child who is then going to go and be in a preschool environment can have time to themselves so that they can, in fact, pursue employment without simply putting it

from one pocket to another pocket, none of which is their pocket.

So the difference, I think, really is you look at it as spending, we look at it as investment. We think it will have big, big return for our country. And that is what Build Back Better is about. The building back better you say it was not related to the pandemic. It clearly was related to the pandemic. The pandemic hit us in the gut. It hit everybody throughout the world in the gut. We have recovered better than anybody else in the world. And that is because we invested, sometimes in a bipartisan way, and sometimes in a partisan way, but we invested in our people, in our children, in our families, in our businesses, and in our health, generally of our country and indeed trying to help other parts of the world as well because this is a global pandemic that affects us all.

But I think the real difference is, we perceive this as an investment. We think it will help grow America. I am sure you have heard me talk about, from time to time, the Make It In America agenda. Our investment in both the infrastructure bill and the Build Back Better will have a positive effect on Make It In America.

So we see it, Mr. Whip, as investment. We think it will have a positive effect. We think it is having a positive effect. And as I say, unemployment is down below 4 percent and jobs are up over 6 million over the last 11 months. So that is a good accomplishment. Is it enough? Do we still have people who aren't working for a varied number of reasons, many of which are related to COVID-19?

So we see it as an investment, and I am hopeful the Build Back Better Act will pass and I hope that will have a positive effect not only on, as the President says, the next 5 years, but on the next five generations. So we are continuing to pursue that.

But inflation, which is how we started this discussion, is a problem and we need to deal with it. I would be glad to talk to the gentleman about what he thinks will be helpful to do that. I know part of that is stop spending money. I think if we stop investing money, our country will not get to where it wants to be and where it is now with respect to the rest of the world, leading the rest of the world in terms of economic recovery from the pandemic. We are not there yet but we are going to get there.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman, and clearly we have a difference on—

Mr. HOYER. Right.

Mr. SCALISE. What the effects of spending trillions of dollars would have. And Build Back Better, as the gentleman brought up, would be about \$4.5 trillion of higher taxes, additional spending, things that, by many accounts, would increase inflation even higher; but we will see where the Senate goes on that bill. I am not sure if the gentleman is anticipating bringing

other legislation, the bipartisan bills that we did, to do things like create Operation Warp Speed, which was maybe one of the most successful things government did in reaction to a pandemic in the history of the world, to come up with not one, not two, but now three proven and effective vaccines in less than a year to a virus no one even knew about. It never happened in the history of the world but something that we came together, Republicans and Democrats with President Trump, to achieve a great achievement, something we would sure urge President Biden to build on.

Because President Biden did run with a promise that he would, “shut down the virus.” Clearly, he has failed at that. We have asked through a number of different means to have hearings on some of the things we have heard concerns about. And I would start with testing. There was an article recently that the President was presented with a plan in October to come up with about 750 million tests that people could have for COVID at home that would be readily available by Christmas where they, in October, anticipated a resurgence of COVID by December.

It has been reported that the President rejected that plan. We have asked for a hearing into that. For whatever reason, the majority has not agreed to that. Here is a letter I sent to Mr. CLYBURN and Mrs. MALONEY through the Select Subcommittee on Coronavirus, as well as through the Committee on Oversight and Reform. Myself and Ranking Member COMER asked to have a hearing into some of these things, the testing failures that were reported. If they are true, we ought to hear about them. If they are false, the administration ought to be pointing that out. They have not, which tells me they must be true. But then why in October would the President have rejected a testing plan that could have prevented us from getting to the place we are at right now with this resurgence?

What about some of the national plans that the President said he had as a candidate that then he later told Governors recently he doesn't have a national plan on COVID. The mixed messaging coming from the administration is causing tremendous confusion across America, and we have asked that we have hearings to clarify, give the administration a chance to state their plan or the lack thereof, state whether or not they rejected a massive testing plan for the Nation in October that would have prevented what happened in December.

The lack of desire by the administration to be transparent about any of this is creating tremendous confusion across the country. This Congress could address that by holding hearings to get the facts out. I know we are going to continue to press for those kinds of hearings. I would hope we have them, but so far we have not gotten

any response to the affirmative on that.

I don't know if the gentleman has anything to add. Maybe the gentleman would agree that we would have these kind of hearings to get some of these facts out or get some of these issues addressed.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would say at the outset, I believe the committee on which he serves with Mr. CLYBURN is one of the committees, among many, who ought to be looking at those facts.

But let me say this, because in stating the facts, as you just did, the appearance is that substantial progress has not been made. I don't think that premise is correct. Let me read you some statistics.

Last year, the first year the President came into office, testing in America was molecular in at-home tests per day. The beginning of last year, 1.7 million per day. Today, 11.7 million tests per day are being conducted.

So to imply that somehow there has not been substantial progress, that is a 10-fold increase in the testing available to Americans every day. And when Biden took office, zero at-home rapid tests were available to consumers—zero. Today, 300 million at-home rapid tests are on the market each month.

Enough? No. Are more coming? Yes.

Has the government used the Defense Production Act to accomplish greater production? They have. The administration started using, as I said, the Defense Production Act. The Biden administration is increasing places people can get free tests, for instance.

You talk about a plan. When Biden took office, there were only 2,500 pharmacies offering free testing. Today, there are 20,000 sites, an 8-fold increase. The administration is purchasing 500 million at-home rapid tests to be distributed for free to Americans who want them, with initial delivery starting this month.

□ 1200

The administration is distributing up to 50 million free at-home self-tests to community health centers and rural health clinics. In addition to already covering PCR tests, the administration is requiring private insurance plans to cover at-home tests starting on January 15, just a couple of days from today. A lot is happening.

Is enough happening? Enough is not happening until everybody has immediate availability. “Immediate” may overstate it, but easy access. The fact is that some people are having problems finding the at-home tests now, and we need to work on that.

Those statistics show you that extraordinary increases have occurred under the Biden administration, and that is their plan, to make sure that these tests are available, because we know that testing will make a dif-

ference. If you find out you are sick, you quarantine.

I suggest to the gentleman that the Biden administration has made an extraordinary difference. Is the situation where we want it to be? Absolutely, it is not.

Do we have a new variant that apparently came out of South Africa or was first identified in South Africa that spiked up?

I talked to Dr. Monahan yesterday, and apparently, just in recent days, we have had a fall-off in disease recognized. I hope that is the case. I hope it keeps going down because we are perhaps now using the KN-95 or N-95 masks and keeping our distance a little more conscientiously. Let's hope all of that works for the people, for the country, and for the globe.

Mr. SCALISE. The problem with President Biden's plan is that it has been reactionary and not visionary. When he was presented with a plan in October to make sure that every American that needed a test would have it in December, when they in October said there will probably be a real uptick in December, the President said no to that.

So if today he says let's go and order 500 million tests, that sounds fine and well, except that he said no to that in October when he could have staved off what we see, and that is hours-long lines of people to get tested. People shouldn't have to be waiting 5 hours in a line to get tested when the President in October was presented with a plan.

Again, if he wasn't, as it has been reported, he should come out publicly and say that. The report has been out for weeks now, and he hasn't done that.

We should be having hearings on this to find out what was the plan that was presented and who was involved, by the way, in rejecting that plan. Was the CDC involved? Was NIH involved? Was HHS involved in rejecting a forward-thinking plan in October that predicted what inevitably did happen this Christmas?

Who was involved in the rejection of that plan, and why did they do it? Is it that the administration doesn't want accountability? I don't know, but we have asked those questions, and we have asked for a hearing on that.

We have been told that it is not going to happen. I hope the gentleman would help push to get this to happen, to find this out so we don't play catch-up every time something happens, when there were there people saying: Let's try to stop something before it becomes a problem.

If there are people in the White House who said, no, we are not going to do it until it is a problem for families, those people ought to be removed from the White House. And they shouldn't be involved in the decisionmaking chain because their decisions caused maybe more death, surely caused a dramatic increase in ills that people are facing right now because it could have been staved off, and it wasn't. We don't

have that information from an administration who promised to be transparent.

We did have a hearing a few days ago in the select subcommittee. It was a private hearing; it wasn't open to the public. I didn't agree with that, but that was the decision made by the majority. We have to start having transparency, as was promised to the people.

People deserve transparency. They deserve to have these questions answered and, frankly, to have a more forward-thinking plan, not a reactionary plan when forward-thinking was presented and rejected.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Madam Speaker, this has been a calm discussion so far. Let me remind the gentleman that the previous President said in February or March of 2020 that this is going to go away in about 30 days. Don't worry about it. It will go away.

A lot of your Members said we don't need a mask; we don't need to keep distance; we don't need to wash our hands; this is going to go away. It is here today and gone tomorrow. That was the previous administration's plan.

I agree with you. The science community, the private-sector community, and government on Operation Warp Speed did a good job—extraordinary work in the private sector, extraordinary work around the world. Because of the computer age in which we live, they were able to share information instantaneously, in real time, and say that this alternative doesn't work, which accelerated greatly the ability to get, within a year, an extraordinary accomplishment, largely from our scientific and medical community but facilitated by Warp Speed. No doubt about that. Give credit where credit is due.

Very frankly, the leader—unlike President Biden, who said this is a problem; we have to be careful; we have to pursue it; we have to invest—said no problem. The gentleman conveniently forgets that.

He also ignores the statistics I just gave where we have had a tenfold, eightfold increase in the availability of testing and pharmaceutical access for literally millions of people. This is per day that we are talking about, 11.7 million people per day.

It doesn't take too long at that rate that the whole country, all 330 million people, in about a month and a few days has been taken care of. When you say we have to make progress, we have made extraordinary progress.

Our view is—and I know we differ on this—we have made investments in the American Rescue Plan Act to deal with the pandemic crisis; in the infrastructure bill to create jobs, additional manufacturing capacity, and training and apprenticeships for our people; in the Build Back Better bill to make sure that our families can keep their

heads above water and can, in fact, have childcare that they can rely on and feel their children are safe so they can take a job, be productive citizens, and add to the growth of our economy.

We believe we are doing that. Are we doing it perfectly? None of us do it perfectly. Perhaps we need to do more, as the gentleman implies, and have hearings.

The gentleman says he was in a hearing. Private or public, I presume the gentleman had an opportunity to ask questions. I don't know who the witnesses were, so I don't know what expertise they have.

I can't believe that if you requested of Mr. CLYBURN that you have relevant witnesses to come by and that you want to question about the progress that either has been made or you think ought to be made or further things that could be done, I can't believe that he wouldn't agree to do that.

In any event, great progress is being made, but the entire world—not the Biden world, not America—the entire world is confronting a crisis and is having a tough time getting ahold of it. We have done it better than anybody else in terms of growing our economy and keeping our people's heads above water. That is to be applauded.

Do we still have a challenge? We do. Are we still working on it? We are. Do we need to continue? Yes.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, under President Trump, when he created Operation Warp Speed, the one thing he did say is that we are going to move red tape so we can focus the entire scientific community, both the Federal agencies but also the private sector, in working together in removing the red tape so they can focus on getting a vaccine. He didn't say three, but he said let's at least get them the ability, all of these great companies, many that are American companies, to go put their innovation to work and get bureaucracy and red tape out of the way and follow science but expedite so that we can get there quicker when many scientists, including some who still testify at committees today, said it was going to take years to get a vaccine.

In less than a year, we had three. President Biden inherited that when he walked in the door and took the oath of office. He had three proven vaccines.

I know the gentleman talks about statistics. Look at COVID deaths. During the campaign, President Biden not only said he would crush the virus, but he said that anybody who presided over that many deaths—that was months before the election—doesn't deserve to be President of the United States. I thought that was an inappropriate statement.

More people have died under President Biden's watch from COVID than under President Trump's. It was an unfair standard that President Biden put in place when he was at one of the debates. If he is going to say things like he is going to crush the virus and going

to have a plan, but then he comes out and obviously didn't crush the virus and tells Governors that there is no Federal plan, I do think that is a mixed message, at the least. That dereliction in his promise, at the worst, ought to be confronted.

What is the plan, if there is a plan? If there is not a plan, admit there is not a plan. But you campaigned saying there was going to be a plan, and clearly, there is not one. Those are other facts that we can put on the table.

Clearly, when you look at how President Trump pushed the Federal Government to work and partner with the private sector to move red tape so we can expedite the research and the trials, more tests than were ever done maybe on any other attempt for a vaccine, and come up in less than a year with vaccines when many said it would take years, it was clearly a remarkable achievement that we all worked on. President Trump led the effort, and we funded it in a very bipartisan way, and it was very effective.

Obviously, this is a challenge for every country. There were other things said that ought to be put out there, and let's at least try to all be saying the same thing and focusing on the same thing.

When scientific experts say that this is what we anticipate happening—if you are going to reject that science, at least hold people accountable who were part of the discussions to reject that science, as I referred to the October rejection of a testing plan that would have been in effect for December that was rejected.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. For a long time, the former President of the United States—apparently, he changed his view now and criticized DeSantis for not pursuing mask wearing, et cetera, et cetera. The fact of the matter is, of course, the former President discouraged wearing masks early on. He discouraged it; Oh, no, you don't need to wear a mask.

He had events that were spreader events, as we call them.

The gentleman heard me say that I think the President followed good advice and made a decision on Warp Speed that was helpful. As the gentleman noted, it was the scientists at NIH and scientists in the private sector and scientists throughout the world, but mainly our people, who did an extraordinary thing in an extraordinarily short timeframe—never been done before—to develop this kind of vaccine.

You talk about the three vaccines. The three manufacturers, it had never been done before. It was a wonderful event. Unfortunately, too many people are advising: Don't take the vaccine. You don't have to take the vaccine. Don't sweat it.

The government tells people they have to vaccinate their children to send them to school. Why? So other children don't get sick.

I told you I had those great-grandchildren, three of whom are in school. They have a child that sits in front of them, a child that sits to the right, a child that sits to the left, and a child that sits behind them. I want all of them well because I don't want my great-grandchild getting sick.

I don't think there was a very successful effort either by the former President or by many on your side of the aisle to say—you talk about science—do what the scientists tell you to do. Now, I notice most of your Members are doing so now, but still some wear it as a badge of courage and raise money off of it. I think that is harmful to our communities.

I think you sort of just set aside no plan. Well, no plan has resulted going from 1.7 million to 11.7 million tests per day. That is the plan. We invested in March, in the American Rescue Plan Act, in making sure that health services could respond properly. A lot of money went into health and testing in the American Rescue Plan.

You keep saying there is no plan. We have adopted plans, and we think they are positive plans. We think, hopefully, that we are going to get better soon.

Neither President Trump nor President Biden was responsible for this extraordinary virus. Our view is President Trump laid back for a long, long time before he really engaged heavily in this, and now he has changed his tune to a much more positive "listen to the scientists" kind of attitude, which we welcome.

□ 1215

I disagree with the gentleman that there is not a plan. We adopted together in 2020 five major pieces of legislation to address this challenge, and we have adopted in a partisan way, unfortunately, bills that continue to fight that fight, and I think it is fighting it, not as successfully because we have a new variant, much more transmissible, a different type. It has metastasized into a more communicable disease. That has caused us a challenge, we are addressing that, and we are accelerating the availability of resources to do so.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, we have some disagreements, but as we both have advocated for the vaccine, I do think one of the differences that we may have is that I strongly feel that it is a personal decision. It is a medical decision. And if government thinks that shaming people, threatening people, and firing people is going to address that challenge, they have missed the mark, and I wish they would instead move away from the shame and the firing. Hopefully the U.S. Supreme Court agrees with us and stops at least the firings of people by mandates from the government and just encourages people to have that conversation with their doctor if they have hesitation. But, ultimately, it is a decision that each individual would have to make.

We will continue this conversation I am sure, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I just want to say in terms of where we are today, the overwhelming percentage—I am talking about 90 percent—of people who are getting really sick are people who are not vaccinated. And for the government to say: You need to be vaccinated because we don't want you coming to the office, we don't want you coming with other people who are being careful, who have been vaccinated, and who have done the responsible thing and getting them sick. Because what we have seen, unfortunately, even with vaccination, is that people who are vaccinated, of our own Members on both sides of the aisle who have been vaccinated, have gotten—thankfully—mild cases of COVID.

But when we talk about the President wanting people to get vaccinated—and my friend indicates that he and I both are advocates of that, and/or requiring them to get vaccinated—the reason you require people to get vaccinated, the more people you have unvaccinated, the more hosts this virus has to metastasize and to grow into a different type of virus that can attack in different ways. That is why you do that. That is why they talk 70 percent. Now we just have about 70 percent in America now. Very frankly, if we had a higher percentage we would be better off. So let's hope that we can work together to make sure that we give encouragement to people to do what the scientists advise.

My friend talks about the reason we were so successful in that year under Warp Speed of getting those three vaccines is because the scientists knew what had to be done. They found out and they had quick discoveries and eliminated a lot of dead-ends relatively quickly because of our computer capability and transformation of information around the world and dead-ends.

If we listen to them, we would be better off. But an awful lot of people are saying: Don't listen to them. Don't do it.

When the gentleman says for health reasons, there are hundreds, probably billions, I don't know what the billions are, people who have been vaccinated with a miniscule and almost undetectable adverse reaction. So I don't know what the gentleman talks about for health reasons. I know Djokovic is saying he is doing it for health reasons. I don't know what those are. Maybe my friend does. I am not an expert enough to know what that is. But all the doctors I talk to—and certainly our own doctor here whom we consult with on a regular basis, I know both of us have done that—say get the vaccine.

So I would hope that all of us would ask our constituents to get the vaccine. It is good for you, it saves your lives, it saves your families, and it saves others. Get it.

Mr. SCALISE. To be clear, I never said it was for health reasons. I said it was a health decision. So this is a medical decision that people are making.

Again, in the past we have seen this suggested by some in the medical community inaccurately that if you get vaccinated you can't get the virus. A Supreme Court Justice said that if you get vaccinated you can't spread the virus. That turned out to be false. We know whether vaccinated or not you can get the virus. You can receive the virus, you can give it to other people, and you can die. We know in the hospitals the higher propensity of people in the hospitals are unvaccinated.

Those are the kinds of things that we should be encouraging to get the facts out and then encouraging people to go make their decision with their doctor if they have concerns and questions.

There are valid questions. There are people in the past who have raised religious exemptions to other vaccines and, by the way, been given approval for those religious exemptions that today are not getting similar religious exemptions for this.

So let's just treat it equally, let's treat it fairly, and let's just focus on the facts. This idea that if you mandate something and threaten somebody it is going to change behavior, it is just not proving itself to be correct, and it is causing more division and forcing people into corners that they shouldn't be on. So hopefully, again, we can continue this conversation and get back to a place where we are in agreement which we have been in things like Operation Warp Speed.

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

HAPPY FOUNDERS DAY TO DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INCORPORATED

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate 109 years of sisterhood, scholarship, and service in Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated.

Founders Day embodies the living legacy of our predecessors. Today six members of the Congressional Black Caucus—Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE, Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS, Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH, Congresswoman STACEY PLASKETT, and I—stand proudly in our Founders' footsteps.

Happy Founders Day to the Columbus Alumnae Chapter, Delta Kappa Chapter, and to all my sisters in Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2201. An act to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training, and for other purposes.