

Moulton (Rice (NY))	Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)	Strickland (DeBene)
Napolitano (Correa)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)	Rush (Underwood)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Pingree (Kuster)	Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Porter (Wexton)		

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO ALS DISABILITY INSURANCE ACCESS ACT OF 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 579) to make a technical correction to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 579

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

SECTION 1. RETROACTIVE ACCESS TO SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFITS INDIVIDUALS WITH AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS (ALS).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b) of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-250) is amended by striking “applications for disability insurance benefits filed after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “applications for disability insurance benefits approved after the date that is 5 months before the date of enactment of this Act”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-250).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with the last votes no later than 3 p.m.

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

In addition, we will consider two bills to honor Women's History Month, including the Violence Against Women Act. This legislation is essential to help stamp out domestic abuse, violence against women and girls, and sexual harassment, and to provide victims and survivors with the resources to recover and seek justice. In addition to that, the House will consider a resolution to remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

The House will also consider two bills to address our broken immigration system. The first, H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act, is to protect Dreamers and those with TPS and DED status. In addition, the Farm Workforce Modernization Act is to create a pathway for agricultural workers to earn legal status and to reform the H-2A program, a bill which enjoys broad bipartisan support.

Additionally, the House will consider a bill to ensure that we preclude cuts to Medicare, as well as farm supports and other programs implicated by sequestration.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the update on the schedule.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, we have been getting a number of concerns expressed from Members on our side—and I would imagine on the gentleman's side as well—about the erratic floor schedule, the changes that have occurred. This week, we were supposed to be here Tuesday to Friday. It was changed to Monday to Thursday. Next week, initially, the calendar showed that it was a week for Members to be in their districts.

Madam Speaker, we all have challenges in our districts. There are small businesses that are struggling to stay afloat. Many Members are working with their local school boards to try to encourage schools to reopen. And all the other challenges that people have, whether it is trying to get water or spread distribution of the vaccine, as they set those meetings in their districts, when the floor schedule changes here, it disrupts their ability to properly represent their districts.

I know the schedule is laid out for the year for a reason, so that Members can manage both the schedule here—and we all represent 750,000 people, roughly, back home—and the ability to properly meet with and represent constituents who aren't even allowed to come to this Capitol to meet with us, so we want to go meet with them back home. It is hard to do that when the schedule continues to change.

If the gentleman would address the concerns that have been raised, rightfully so, about those erratic changes, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I agree with the Members, and I regret that we have had such a necessity on too many occasions to change the schedule. We did so, of course, to accommodate not only work done but also the very, very unusual start that we have had to this session, a tragic start that we have had to this session, dealing with issues that we would have preferred not to deal with, but we had to as a result of the insurrection that occurred on January 6, and other actions, including the security that the gentleman referred to. That concerns us all.

As somebody who represents the Washington metropolitan region, the openness of our Capitol is of particular concern to me because my constituents all live within driving distance, an hour or less. So, I share the view.

Madam Speaker, I want to assure Members that we are going to make every effort and that we are trying to now finalize. We already have April, May, June, and July as the schedule. I think that will not be changed in any dramatic fashion. But when we have the final, I hope to make sure that everybody, next week, before we leave here, knows what is going to happen in April, May, June, July, before the August break. Because I understand, when the schedule is changed, for whatever reasons, however justified they may be, it does disrupt.

Although I heard some criticism last Wednesday that we didn't come in Thursday, no Member came up to me complaining that we didn't come in Thursday. I did hear some political rap about it, but I didn't hear any Members say, “Oh, jeez, I really wanted to come in Thursday.” That usually is the case.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman that we got all of our work done last week. All that was scheduled was done.

I will assure the gentleman that we are working very hard so that, the next 4 months, Members can rely on it when they see on the calendar that they have to be here or they don't have to be here, or that we are going to consider this, that, and the other.

We are going to try to hew very, very closely to that because I do appreciate that when you change the schedule, it is very disruptive for people's lives, for people's businesses, for our constituents.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

I appreciate the acknowledgment about the concerns and the disruptions of schedules as Members try to meet the needs of their constituents back home, as well as doing the work up here. Clearly, getting our work done is the first and most important priority to addressing those needs.

Hopefully, as we look toward our return after we come back in April, the appropriations process will begin. We would surely like to see us get back to a more regular order for doing appropriations bills, where we can have bills

go through committee, go through a markup process, with bipartisan input, which we haven't seen, but, ultimately, be able to bring those bills to the floor with a typical, traditional amendment process.

Madam Speaker, I know the gentleman is well aware of this. Historically, when appropriations bills come to the floor, there are many amendments. Sometimes, it is a completely wide-open amendment process, which we would surely encourage.

I know many of those years when we were in the majority and bills would come to the floor that were appropriations, a Member literally could write their amendment on a piece of paper and turn it in and that amendment would be debated and voted on, on the House floor. Sometimes, you would see over 100 amendments on a single appropriations bill, which are all important and should be debated, so we would go to 2-minute votes.

The question I would have is, now that we have seen—from reports I have seen, and maybe you have too—that roughly 75 percent of all Members in this House have had a vaccination for COVID-19, there is a strong desire to get back to a regular floor schedule here on the floor, where we are conducting our business and have the ability to interact with each other as colleagues.

It is a much different experience than when people have to trickle in, trickle out, limiting the number of people, the ability to debate things, 45-minute votes for every bill. If you have 100 amendments on a bill, this House can't function at 45 minutes per vote. To get back to a 15-minute, 5-minute, and 2-minute voting schedule—again, CDC guidance just came out this week, saying if someone is vaccinated, they don't even have to have a mask to be around other people.

The Senate doesn't require masks on their floor. There is no reason why we would have to have a mask to have this conversation. The President of the United States doesn't wear a mask when he is giving speeches, or his Press Secretary when she is meeting with the press.

Can we get back to a regular floor operating schedule where we can meet as colleagues in person? If somebody doesn't want to be around others, maybe a voting station can be set up. But for anybody else who wants to interact following CDC guidance, recognizing the vaccination rate, and getting back to the ability to have a voting schedule that allows us to conduct business the way we are going to need to when we start taking up those appropriations bills, I would ask the gentleman if he has a plan for that, if he could lay that out.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that would certainly be the ideal. There is no doubt about that. We would like to get to that position.

We continue to consult the Capitol physician on his advice on what we ought to be doing. It would be a lot simpler if every Member had been vaccinated, I will tell my friend. Although, obviously, the information as to who gets a vaccination and who does not is privileged and private information, as it should be, I would ask my friend to urge his Members to get the vaccination so that both sides will know that all of our Members have been vaccinated. That will facilitate getting to where the gentleman wants to get and where, I share his view, I want to get and the Speaker wants to get. So, we will continue to talk about that.

Although we have a regular schedule, it is not the old schedule. It is not the 15-minute vote or 17- or 20-minute vote that we had, which was much more efficient, as you may have seen me quoted in the paper the other day about virtual, that we prefer to come together in this Chamber, in committee rooms, on this campus, to discuss with one another, to work with one another. We think that is the ideal, and we hope to get there as soon as possible.

We are making progress, obviously. We are getting a lot of Americans vaccinated. We are not anywhere close to the 75 percent yet, but, hopefully, we will be there soon.

I would think and hope we could get to 100 percent of Members and make sure that our staff is vaccinated as well. The sooner we do that, the sooner we can accomplish what the gentleman wants to accomplish.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I hope the gentleman is not suggesting that it would take a 100 percent vaccination rate. I know with the rest of the country, when States make decisions to reopen, when CDC issues guidance, I have never seen any guidance that said 100 percent vaccination is the standard for bringing something back.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would yield because I would suggest that if we are at 75 percent now, you also have Members who have antibodies, who may have had COVID months ago and who have even taken the test that shows they have antibodies. Whether they have taken the vaccine or not, the antibodies can fight off COVID.

□ 1245

But at 75 percent, is there a number higher than that that the gentleman is setting as a standard?

I would hope it wouldn't be 100, but I would also hope we could have a conversation together to work through what that standard should be so we can get to a place where we have a normal operating process both in the House and in committees.

The committee work being done virtually is a true disservice to the ability for us to collegially work on issues. Many of our committees deal with not

the high-profile issues that are the battleground issues where we are on our own sides, but in many cases it is where one sees the kind of collegiality where Congress can come together and work, and that isn't happening either.

I would hope we could come up with a standard that is not 100 percent. If we are at 75, then it has got to be somewhere at a different place to get back to a House floor functioning schedule, as well as a committee structure.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

Let me make a few comments. First of all, the gentleman mentioned about the White House and the President. I am going down with the President, who is going to sign the American Rescue Plan tomorrow, an extraordinary piece of legislation that we are very excited about and that is going to help literally millions and millions of Americans and our entire economy, our families, and our children. So we are very excited about that.

I was required to have a test. Now, I have had two shots, but I was required to have a test this morning by the Capitol physician before I went down to the White House. The gentleman says that you don't wear a mask, but one has to have a test before one gets into the room.

Now, with respect to the 100 percent, I think we ought to have 100 percent. I think everybody in this body and every one of our staff ought to have the vaccine to make sure that we are safe and that others who deal with us are safe. The CDC guidelines, by the way, recommend that people be vaccinated but that they avoid medium and large crowds.

Now, depending upon what the gentleman says, Madam Speaker, if you have 300 people on this floor, that is a reasonably good-sized crowd, and we are in great proximity to one another because of the size of this Chamber.

The CDC also says—the Senate has not listened to the CDC. The CDC says wear masks. So in terms of the gentleman's suggestion about the CDC changing its rules, that is true, but they haven't changed their rule on masks. They say wear a mask and try not to congregate in large crowds.

However, having said that, we want to get to the same objective that the gentleman references, and we are working towards that with the consideration of the safety of our staff, the safety of our Members, and the safety of security folks. We hope to get there sooner rather than later, and we are working on it.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate the gentleman's offer to work. Obviously, when one looks at the way the Senate operates, they have said that to speak, especially, you don't need to wear a mask.

I don't see the science that would say that the gentleman and I have to wear masks to have this conversation.

Again, I would direct my friend to when the President is giving a speech, he is not wearing a mask. If there are other people around, then they might be wearing a mask; but when they speak, they take off their mask. Just look at those protocols as well and just try to inject some of those common-sense measures to try to get back to doing our job.

One final point, I hope, again, we would all want everyone who has the interest in getting the vaccine to have access to the vaccine. But if one Member out of 435 felt they didn't want to have the vaccine, then I would hope that wouldn't be enough to prohibit the rest of us from carrying out more normal functions on the House floor and in committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. My point on the White House was that a Member may decide that. And if they don't want to get a test, then they can't go to the White House, for the safety of everybody there.

Mr. SCALISE. If maybe a requirement of a test once a week when we come in or something like that would help get us to a better place where we can have in-person, on the floor, and in-committee processes and meetings—the testing capability is now there in the Attending Physician's office. If it needs to be widened more, I know there are other rooms that are doing some of the testing—then that would be a suggestion, I think, worth us discussing if it helps us get back to a more functioning Congress, especially a more functioning House on the floor and in committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, everybody in America wants to get back to normal. Everybody in America. We agree with them, and we are hopeful that we will get there sooner rather than later, and we are making good progress.

We just, yesterday, invested a large number, billions of dollars, to facilitate getting to where we want to be. And Americans want to be in testing, vaccination, and tracing. So I don't want to have anybody think we are in disagreement. We want to get there. We want to get there safely. We want to get there consistent with good health practices and the advice of the scientists and the physicians who treat us. But we are talking about it as we were here this week, and we are going to be talking about it next week because we all want to get to the same place.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that.

Again, hopefully, this is a discussion that we can all have, not just the majority making this decision, but the majority working with the minority.

We have an active group of Members who are medical doctors, the Doctors Caucus, who have a lot of good suggestions. I think they are going to try to

meet with the House Attending Physician. Hopefully, that can spur some additional ideas about how we can do this, and then have us work together to achieve that.

Finally, on the House committee schedule especially, we have taken up 14 different rules bills this Congress so far, bills that have actually come to the floor under a rule. Unfortunately, only one of those bills actually went to committee. Meaning, 13 of the 14 bills never even went to committee to have the debate in the openness and the transparency that this Congress deserves.

I think that millions of people across the country would expect that we would be having—as we are shaping policy, that it is not just a one-sided approach. That if a socialist agenda is being pushed by one side, then can't the other side at least have that discussion in a committee process and offer amendments?

The amendment process is critically important, and that has been lost too often—even the \$1.9 trillion spending bill that over 90 percent of which had nothing to do with health needs and not a dime of which was dedicated to safely reopening schools, which is a huge cry amongst millions of parents across the country.

Madam Speaker, not only on one side, but, frankly, nobody on the majority side was even allowed to offer an amendment. A \$1.9 trillion spending bill, probably the largest bill that has come through Congress in the history of our country, and not a single amendment, Democrat or Republican, was allowed in the House on that bill to be brought forward.

We were able to bring some amendments in committee. Every one of them was voted down or removed. Not one Democrat that I saw was even allowed to bring an amendment up in committee on a \$1.9 trillion bill.

That is a major concern. It is a concern that denies the people's House from being able to express the will of the people when we have ideas and suggestions maybe, for example, as we wanted to in the House to say: Should a felon who is in a prison be able to get a \$1,400 check?

We weren't even able to bring that amendment up for debate.

Can we at least require that schools reopen?

If hundreds of billions of new dollars are going to go to schools, shouldn't the requirement be that they use that following the CDC guidance and following the science that is widespread that says the schools should be open and that long-term damage is being done to kids by not being in the classroom?

Millions and millions of kids—maybe over 60 percent of the children in America—are not getting daily in-the-classroom learning. Unions are more concerned, saying: You can go to spring break if you are a union member, but just don't post pictures be-

cause we don't want anybody to see it—when they should be in the classroom teaching our kids.

That debate never got to happen here on the House floor and, frankly, in most of the committees. Because these bills aren't going through committee. And that one bill went through committee with the order clearly given not to allow a single amendment. Not a single amendment in the House was added to a \$1.9 trillion spending bill.

I am sure some people might think that was the perfect bill, that there was not a single change. But sometimes the smallest bill has a change made that makes it a better bill, but not that bill. That kind of closed process is not who we should be as a House.

Madam Speaker, 13 out of 14 bills didn't even go through committee, and the one that did—the \$1.9 trillion bill—not a single amendment by a Republican or Democrat in the House was allowed to be added. I hope that is not the standard. It is surely not reflective of what this House should be doing.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman was here in 2017, of course. There was a bill that approximated the size of this bill. It was about \$1.5 trillion, \$1.6 trillion. This is a little more—substantially a little more, \$300 billion, \$400 billion, but in the same ballpark. There were no hearings on that bill. There were no amendments on that bill. It came to the floor, and there were no amendments to that bill. None. Zero.

Now, of course, 83 percent of that bill went to the top 1 percent of Americans. This bill was just about the opposite; 85 to 90 percent go to probably the bottom two-fifths in terms of income level and wealth. Hundreds of amendments were offered, as the committees marked up their instructions from the Budget Committee. Hundreds.

Amendments were, of course, offered in the Senate, as well. As my friend knows, they had their vote-a-rama; they met for over 24 hours. To indicate that this bill did not have a robust committee process in which Republicans and Democrats could offer amendments and have them adopted, I think, is not accurate, with all due respect, Madam Speaker.

Furthermore, this bill enjoyed the overwhelming support of the American people. Madam Speaker, 77 percent of Americans—59 percent of Republicans in the Morning Consult poll, 67 percent of Americans supporting the minimum wage, which was rejected, of course, by the parliamentarian in the Senate; 83 percent of Americans supporting H.R. 1, one of the bills that passed; 89 percent supporting comprehensive background checks, which passed today; 72 percent of Americans supporting equal protections for LGBTQ Americans.

The point I am making is, A, the bill to which my friend refers, the American Rescue Plan, had very substantial consideration over days.

The Ways and Means markup took 2 days and many amendments offered. So

from the standpoint of the public's knowing what was going on, I would suggest to my friend that that was very much greater than when the tax bill—about the same—in the same range of, in that case, \$1.5 trillion with interest approaching the \$1.9 trillion. So we think, very frankly, that there has been a lot of discussion on that bill.

One of the things, Madam Speaker, that concerned me the most was we worked in a bipartisan fashion on six prior bills. One passed on voice vote, the CARES Act, on the floor. Others passed with well over 150 Republicans and well over 150 Democrats—more than that, but well over 300 votes. They were all bipartisan. They were negotiated with the administration—the Trump administration. The CARES Act, Madam Speaker, was about exactly the same amount of dollars, and it passed on a voice vote here.

What was the difference?

Trump was President. That was the difference in all five. And it had been negotiated with him—or the Secretary of the Treasury, to be more accurate.

But substantively there was very little difference in terms of the broad nature of their impact, the dollar value of the bills, and the diversity of their objectives. To that extent, they were very much like this bill.

But, Madam Speaker, what was the difference?

The same thing that was the difference when we did the Recovery Act in '09. The gentleman was here. He was elected in '08. He came here and he voted "no" on the Recovery Act. Every Republican voted "no" on the Recovery Act—\$787 billion. In my view, it kept us out of a depression. But that was not my view alone. It was Bernanke's view and it was the Secretary of the Treasury's view. So we see the same thing happen again. We went from bipartisan to partisan votes.

I, frankly, Madam Speaker, find it hard to believe that there wasn't a single Republican who thought the investments in opening up schools—some people say, well, you open up schools, that is the big cry now.

Yes, and we are doing something about it. They weren't open when we took over, but they are coming to be open.

I think it is unfortunate, Madam Speaker, that some demean our teachers. I will tell you, Madam Speaker, I have four great-grandchildren. All but one, who is too young, were taught virtually for these many, many months.

And my granddaughter, their mother, raves about their commitment of the teachers to those three children, and the work that they put in, day after day after day.

□ 1300

So are they concerned about their own safety? Are they concerned about the safety of the children? Are they concerned about other children and children taking it home to their moms

and dads or their grandparents? They are. So we need to be safe.

But this bill, which all our Republican friends voted against, has substantial billions in there to make the schools safe so that people can go back with the confidence that they will be safe.

So I would simply say to my friend and others that they have talked about openness. In the 115th Congress—that is the last Congress in which there was a Republican majority—there was not a single open rule, not one. In the 115th Congress, you had 103 closed rules. In the last Congress, which we were in charge, we had that number to less than 52, 51.

JIM MCGOVERN, the chairman of the Rules Committee, is very committed to trying to make amendments, including amendments on the Republican side, in order; and I have urged him to do that.

So, hopefully, we will move forward in a way that continues to allow this House to operate effectively, and also give opportunity to your side and our side to raise issues.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, when you look at the bill that passed yesterday, the only bipartisan vote was against the bill. Every Republican—in fact, a Democrat voted against it as well. You had two Democrats who voted against it originally when it came through the House the first time.

But the bottom line is, it was the majority party and President Biden who chose to go it alone, who chose to have a closed process where Republicans were shut out.

There were many efforts, including a number of Senators going to the White House to meet with the President, who offered ideas, and every one of those ideas was thrown in the trash can. That is not a unity message. That is not trying to work with people from all parties and all walks of life to come up with the best ideas.

It was a go-it-alone socialist agenda, very little focused on COVID; \$1.9 trillion, over 90 percent of which wasn't dedicated to healthcare.

You want to talk about schools. There was not a single dime in that bill that requires schools to reopen. You look at the money for schools, and hundreds of billions of dollars, by the way, are already out there that aren't spent, hundreds of billions that we all worked on together.

When President Trump said he wanted to work with Republicans and Democrats, he actually followed through on that promise, as the gentleman noted, and every CARES Act bill was a very bipartisan bill. That was an effort made on both sides to work together and they were targeted. It was targeted on helping families who were struggling or helping small businesses who were struggling; on getting money into the search for a vaccine.

Operation Warp Speed should be something we all celebrate, where President Trump said he wants to put all the focus at FDA on not only find-

ing a vaccine, but prefunding the manufacturing of the vaccinations even before FDA approves them so we don't have to wait an extra few months that we don't have. That is why we are at a point where we can have 100 million vaccinations. We tried to double that number in this bill. That amendment was voted down.

But on schools, my colleague, ASHLEY HINSON, had a bill to say, let's say if the schools are going to get new money—which they already have enough money to fortify their schools to reopen safely. Many took us up on that and are open in the classroom today. Some have chosen not to, but not for a lack of money. Let's be very clear about that.

In fact, 95 percent of the money for schools in the bill that was passed yesterday can't even be spent this year; 95 percent of it. Then you have hundreds of billions of dollars still unspent that can be used to reopen schools who want to get back in the classroom, that money is already there. That money did not require—that need did not get met yesterday. That need was already met by Congress.

Some chose to do it. Some have chosen not to reopen, even though not only is the money there to reopen, but the science is there. The science lays out not only how to safely reopen, but it points out the devastating damage being done to children in this country by not reopening.

So when the gentleman talks about polls and, well, the polling says this bill is really popular. Hey, do you want a check for \$3,500? I am sure a lot of people would say yes, until they realize that \$350 billion of this money goes to bail out failed States. And a State like California, who has a \$10-plus-billion surplus, is going to get over \$40 billion.

So I am sure if we asked a poll question to people across this country: Do you think it is right to borrow \$1.9 trillion from our children? Because somebody is going to have to pay for this. This money didn't fall out of the sky. Is it right to borrow \$1.9 trillion from our children to give California \$41 billion when they currently have a \$10 billion surplus? I think we would get a different answer than the 70 percent saying yes.

If you said, in this bill, which we tried to correct, every felon in prison today in America will get a \$1,400 check from the taxpayers. That is in the bill.

They tried to take it out in the Senate when they allowed them on the floor to bring an amendment. Not a single amendment was allowed on this House floor to fix those kinds of disparities.

Every Democrat in the Senate voted "no." They said continue to give \$1,400 checks to prisoners, felons in prison, when we are already paying for their food, for their lodging, for their healthcare. Now they are going to get a \$1,400 check from the taxpayers of this country, borrowed from our children.

Do most Americans know that? I hope they do because when we then ask them the question later: Now that you know what is really in the bill, what do you think about it? When you recognize some of the other ideas that were brought forward, not only to reopen schools, but to target the money, to focus on helping small businesses, those were the things that we wanted to do, trying to put some guardrails and limitations in place, like the previous CARES Act bills did, which is why they were all bipartisan.

But when you look at these expenditures, and then you recognize that there is no money requiring schools to reopen. But our border is wide open right now and if someone comes over legally, they will get a check. That is a concern to a lot of people.

So, yes, look at the bill. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, it did go through committee. It did have markups and hearings. And, in fact, it yielded a great benefit to every American. Every income group benefited from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. And, as the gentleman knows, the income group level that benefited the most by us cutting taxes were the lowest income, because we rebuilt our middle class because of that bill. We made America competitive because of that bill.

And in this bill that passed yesterday, with a bipartisan vote against it, there was tucked away language that prohibits States from cutting taxes. Explain what that has to do with COVID.

If you are a State, every State will get money from that bill. Again, California gets over \$40 billion, even though they have a \$10 billion surplus. But if a State tries to cut taxes, they actually get penalized in the bill. People are aghast when they hear that. It just came out yesterday.

What does that have to do with COVID?

Why wasn't this a targeted relief bill? It was because one side wanted to close the process out and just go it alone and push a socialist agenda that has nothing to do, or little to do, with COVID relief.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I don't think there is a socialist agenda on this floor, any more than I think there is a fascist agenda on this floor. And we hear socialist. When Gingrich was here it was liberals. Now it is socialists; trying to distract from substance, trying to inflame.

It wasn't socialists that stormed the Capitol, and they weren't carrying Biden signs, they were carrying Trump signs.

I am tired, Madam Speaker, of this socialist drivel. First of all, I think a lot of them don't have the faintest idea what socialism is versus dictatorship or authoritarian regimes.

And the schools weren't reopened when we took over. Trump was President for 10 months.

The gentleman apparently wants to say in this bill, open the schools no matter what. We don't care what your locals say. We don't care what your PTAs say. We don't care what your superintendents of schools say. Open the schools because we mandate it.

I don't think that is what the gentleman, Madam Speaker, in the past has stood for, mandating what States do. Now maybe he thinks that we ought to take over the local education systems and tell them to open. We didn't do that.

What we did was, however, gave them \$130 billion, over time—he is right, not immediately—over time to spend to make those schools safe; make their ventilation systems safe for kids; make the accommodations in the schools safe for kids and teachers and parents who go there.

So, Madam Speaker, we get distracted by these assertions of some sort of ideological patina that resonates with the right wing in America. And we can do that, or we can talk about substance.

Yes, I mentioned Americans overwhelmingly said that the substance that we had in this bill was what they liked. So, I would hope the Republican whip would talk about the substance of these bills.

We can have differences. But over and over, in the newspapers and on this floor, the socialist agenda resonates in your polls. It resonates in some of the districts; we saw that. It was not true.

Social Security was called socialist when it was adopted; Medicare, as well; Medicaid certainly, socialist, efforts to try to lift people up.

And when the gentleman tries to make an analogy to a bill that sent 83 percent of \$1.5 trillion to the top 1 percent in America as being a bill to help the middle class, and working Americans, boy, that is a stretch, Madam Speaker.

Now, I want to go back to the substance of what the gentleman has raised. We want to see us working together. I see my friend from Texas on the floor. He and I have had these discussions.

It is a shame that we accuse one another of this epithet or that epithet and try to put one another in a corner. I lived through the Gingrich era, and that was almost the entire rhetoric that I heard from the floor all the time.

But if we are going to do that, it is going to be because people really do want to work in a bipartisan fashion.

There was discussion—I know for a fact, I was here, and I saw President Obama try to work in a bipartisan fashion on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Yes, he put his bill on the floor—excuse me—not on the floor, he put it on the table.

And I heard the meetings at the White House. I heard the meetings here when the Republicans said: Well, he didn't try to talk to us; he put this bill on the floor before he even talked to

us. Not on the floor, on the table. I know because I was sitting there in the room when President Obama was trying to reach bipartisan agreement.

Zero Republicans, three in the Senate, helped on the American Recovery Act, which kept us out of depression. And I wasn't surprised that we had zero on this reconciliation bill, and I wasn't surprised that it changed from the six votes previously, where Donald Trump said this bill is okay; I am going to sign it; because nothing could have become law without him signing it. And Republicans voted overwhelmingly, in most cases, for it.

But now that we have a Democratic President, they have decided to return to the “no” votes that they cast on the Recovery Act, on the Affordable Care Act, which has helped millions and millions of people, and so many other pieces of legislation.

I would urge, my friend, Madam Speaker, to, when we say we want to work in a bipartisan way, let's try to do it. It is worth doing.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, it is worth doing. Again, that is why you had a number of Republican Senators go to the White House to offer that olive branch. They were turned down, and that is unfortunate.

On this bill, clearly it wasn't just Republicans who voted against it. It was a bipartisan vote in opposition. I hope that is not the model. And that was the point.

Thirteen of 14 bills have come to the floor under a rule so far; didn't even go through committee. Let's get back to that collegiality. Let's get back to bringing bills to committee, having the committees actually work in person so Members can have the ability to have those conversations and come and find common ground, which has happened in the past, and it surely can happen again now. I hope we can get to that point soon.

I yield to the gentleman to add anything else.

Mr. HOYER. I have nothing to further to say, Madam Speaker.

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

□ 1315

NEVER STOP SAYING HER NAME

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, 1 year ago this Saturday, a young couple in my hometown of Louisville were in bed when their door was broken down. The terrified couple leaped for cover, and the man, a licensed gun owner, fired a single shot toward the men busting into his home, hitting one in the leg.

The intruders responded with a barrage of gunfire so wild that it not only killed the woman but narrowly missed a 5-year-old in another apartment.

There is no mystery about the killers' identities, yet they remain free.