

Gimenez	LaTurner	Rose	Tlaib (Kildee)	Vela (Gomez)	Wilson (FL)
Gohmert	Lesko	Rosendale	Torres (NY)	Velázquez	(Hayes)
Gonzales, Tony	Letlow	Rouzer	(Auchincloss)	(Jeffries)	Wilson (SC)
Gonzalez (OH)	Long	Roy	Van Drew	Wasserman	(Norman)
Good (VA)	Loudermilk	Rutherford	(Norman)	Schultz	Young (Joyce)
Gooden (TX)	Lucas	SCALISE	Veasey	(Deutch)	(OH)
Granger	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	(Fletcher)	Waters (Takano)	
Graves (MO)	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin			
Green (TN)	Mann	Sessions			
Greene (GA)	Massie	Simpson			
Griffith	McCarthy	Smith (MO)			
Grothman	McCaul	Smith (NE)			
Guest	McClain	Smith (NJ)			
Guthrie	McClintock	Smucker			
Hagedorn	McHenry	Spartz			
Harris	McKinley	Stauber			
Harshbarger	Meuser	Steel			
Hartzler	Miller (IL)	Stefanik			
Herrrell	Miller (WV)	Steil			
Herrera Beutler	Miller-Meeks	Steube			
Hice (GA)	Moolenaar	Stewart			
Higgins (LA)	Mooney	Taylor			
Hill	Moore (AL)	Tenney			
Hinson	Moore (UT)	Thompson (PA)			
Hollingsworth	Mullin	Tiffany			
Hudson	Murphy (NC)	Timmons			
Huizenga	Nehls	Turner			
Jackson	Newhouse	Valadao			
Jacobs (NY)	Norman	Van Duyne			
Johnson (OH)	Nunes	Wagner			
Johnson (SD)	Obernolte	Walberg			
Jordan	Owens	Walorski			
Joyce (OH)	Palazzo	Waltz			
Joyce (PA)	Palmer	Weber (TX)			
Keller	Pence	Webster (FL)			
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Wenstrup			
Kelly (PA)	Pfluger	Westerman			
Kinzinger	Posey	Williams (TX)			
Kustoff	Reschenthaler	Wilson (SC)			
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Wittman			
LaMalfa	Rodgers (WA)	Womack			
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Young			
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Zeldin			

NOT VOTING—10

Barr	Graves (LA)	Norcross
Carter (GA)	Hern	Trone
Fulcher	Issa	
Gosar	Johnson (LA)	

□ 1108

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

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “YEA” on Rollcall No. 185.

Stated against:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 185.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt (Moolenaar)	Gottheimer (Panetta)	Miller (WV) (Walorski)
Amodei (Balderson)	Graves (MO) (Wagner)	Mullin (Cole) (Napolitano)
Barragan (Clark) (MA)	Grijalva (García) (IL)	(Correa) (Pappas (Clark) (IL))
Beatty (Lawrence)	Himes (Clark) (MA)	Payne (Pallone)
Buchanan (Walorski)	Hoyer (Brown)	Reed (Gonzalez) (OH)
Burgess (Jackson)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Rice (NY) (Peters)
Castor (FL) (Demings)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Ruiz (Aguilar) (Rush)
Crist (Deutch)	Kuster (Clark) (MA)	(Underwood) (Sewell (DelBene) Sires (Pallone) Stefanik (Katko) Strickland (DelBene) Suozzi (Panetta) Swalwell (Gomez) Titus (Connolly)
DeFazio (Davids) (KS)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lieu (Beyer)	
Escobar (Speier)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	McHenry (Budd)	
Gimenez (Malliotakis)	Meng (Clark) (MA)	

Tlaib (Kildee)	Vela (Gomez)	Wilson (FL)
Torres (NY)	Velázquez	(Hayes)
(Auchincloss)	(Jeffries)	Wilson (SC)
Van Drew	Wasserman	(Norman)
(Norman)	Schultz	Young (Joyce)
Veasey	(Deutch)	(OH)
(Fletcher)	Waters (Takano)	

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 House majority whip the floor schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) my friend, the House majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman allowing me to stand in for the majority leader. I know he joins me in hoping that the majority leader will be back with us very shortly and that this will be his last time having to contend with me. I hope that Mr. HOYER will be rejoining us very soon, as he continues to mend.

Next week, the House will meet on Monday at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

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

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.

On Friday, the House will meet at 11:30 for a pro forma session.

On Monday, we will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, we will consider:

H.R. 3005, legislation to remove the bust of former Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, Confederate statues, and certain other statues.

H.R. 2662, the Inspectors General Independence and Empowerment Act. This legislation is sorely needed in the wake of the prior administration’s assault on the rule of law and independent oversight. It would strengthen the independence of inspectors general and protect their ability to investigate abuses at Federal agencies.

A resolution to establish a select committee to investigate the January 6 attack on the Capitol.

H.R. 3684 will be considered, the INVEST in America Act, to grow our economy and create good jobs by modernizing our Nation’s roads, bridges, rail, and transit. In addition to addressing surface transportation, this bill will also include critical provisions to address our safe drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as we look at some of the bills that are going to be coming to the floor next week, I

know there has been a lot of talk about infrastructure.

As we saw over these past few days, there is a bipartisan bill that is being worked through mostly in the Senate, where a number of Republicans and Democrats had seemed to reach an agreement on what would be considered traditional infrastructure without tax increases. It has now become a little more confused by a suggestion that maybe the Speaker has said it has to be tied to a budget reconciliation bill that would possibly raise taxes, which is surely not where we are. It doesn’t seem to be where the bipartisan group in the Senate is.

I would ask the gentleman: Is there any expectation—because we don’t have a budget that has moved through the House, and a budget would have to move first to create the ability for a budget reconciliation bill to move through the House or the Senate, if that even happened.

Is there expectation there would be a budget resolution coming to the floor in the upcoming weeks?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1100

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

I have not consulted with the majority leader on that subject. I suspect that we will wait for the Senate’s actions and make determinations as needed when we get some definition as to what they are going to do.

I understand that the gentleman indicates that what has occurred regarding the bipartisan legislation is of concern, but I assure the gentleman that the President made it very clear from the beginning that he has a definition of infrastructure that goes into family needs that are more or less nontraditional, and I think that all that the Speaker has been talking about is to reinforce her beliefs that the President is correct in his thoughts.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, for decades, we have never really had a disagreement on what infrastructure means. I think most Americans would recognize the definition that we have always gone by on a bipartisan basis, and it is roads and bridges, waterways and ports.

I think, recently, both sides would agree that broadband is something that we would include in that definition, but that is what always was the traditional definition of infrastructure by both parties.

It seems like on the majority side they are trying to change that definition to include a lot of extraneous things of which were not part of the Senate bipartisan agreement. But the other new addition seems to be this idea that a bill, a shell reconciliation bill to raise taxes, would now be something that would maybe hold hostage the rest of the bipartisan agreement.

I hope that is not the road we go down, especially considering there does

seem to be a lot of bipartisan movement on something that we would all agree is traditional infrastructure.

I know the bill next week that is being brought to the House floor does not meet that bipartisan test of what Senators and others who are trying to work together have reached agreement on. So, hopefully, this doesn't get bogged down in a fight on things that are not considered infrastructure.

I don't know if the gentleman has anything to add to it. I would hope we would go down the road where both parties could come to an agreement and we could actually get something done.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

I don't know that I have any more to add to that except to say that, if we go back into history, we have got to know that rail was not infrastructure until Abraham Lincoln decided that it should be. Interstate highways were not infrastructure until Dwight Eisenhower decided that they should be. And broadband was not infrastructure until now. I think that is because we are being more futuristic when we think about what the needs are going to be in this great country as we move forward.

I am glad that the gentleman agrees that broadband is, in fact, an infrastructure issue. A couple years ago, I had a very hard time getting people to understand that. COVID-19 has revealed to us that there are things that we did not consider in the past which we must consider going forward. Broadband is one of them. Family infrastructure needs or a few other things.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. I hope as we look toward something that we could all agree on, that that is the road we stay on, so to speak, as we talk about infrastructure, not extraneous things that we don't agree on.

Clearly, we have looked at and agreed on things like broadband, and we have seen the FCC take good steps to continue to expand broadband, especially in rural areas where there is a true digital divide that we are trying to overcome.

I know Congress has come together many times in the last few years to try to put more money in place to bridge that gap on the digital divide. There is still more work to do. Especially during the pandemic, we saw there are more needs. But if we could keep it focused on those things, I think you will see a lot of bipartisan agreement. Once it gets beyond that, that is where things break down.

What I want to ask about, something that is going to expire at the end of next week, and that is this proxy voting scheme that has been going on since May of last year.

From what the majority had presented when this got created was the reason that proxy voting was there is

because we had a pandemic and things were shut down, and people had trouble getting around and maybe were concerned about the virus and not wanting to leave maybe their home or their local community.

Obviously now, with a vaccine readily available for any American who wants to take it, with more States opening up, and you are seeing even here in Congress many committees that were not having in-person hearings are now getting back to in-person hearings.

So what I would ask the gentleman is: When proxy voting expires on July 3, can we let Congress get back to the normal work and not renew proxy voting?

Because, as we have seen, there is a lot more cooperation, a lot more agreement you can reach when you are here in person working together that you just can't get on a Zoom or Webex call or just somebody staying at home proxy voting and not coming here to Washington when now everyone, who wants to, can come.

We have looked at what this has done. It has hurt the institution, in our opinion. But there are six Democrats who, since this got started last year, have never come to vote in person except for the vote for Speaker of the House because that is a vote that you cannot cast by proxy. So if they were able to get here for the vote for Speaker in January, yet on every other vote have not cast a single vote in person, then it is clear it is not because they have no ability to get to Washington.

It feels like there is an abuse of this proxy voting that has shown it needs to end. I don't know if there is an expectation next week that the majority would renew this. We would urge strongly that we let it expire on July 3, and then get back to the work that we do in person.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

I assure the gentleman that his concerns are well considered on this side of the aisle. Next week will be our last week before going into the Independence Day break, and I suspect some assessments will be made between now and our returning after the July 4 holiday.

As you know, we have gone from 45 minutes down to 20 minutes. Now I am looking forward to us going to the regular 15 minutes now that people are gathering on the floor.

We want to be a family-friendly Congress. Families are reordering their businesses so that their children and other children can be accounted and taken care of as we return back to normal. These considerations are not just for us, but they are for what is happening back in communities and whether or not these communities are being stood up in such a way that childcare can be available and other things that will keep families intact.

But I assure you that we are concerned about getting back to regular order, and I look for that to occur hopefully soon after the July 4 holiday.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. Hopefully, we just let it expire. Clearly, that is our hope. We urge the majority to consider that because, if you look at voting, it is good that we are finally limiting the time so we can have a normal voting schedule or at least get closer to that.

As we look at the appropriations process, for example, where appropriations bills will start moving out of committee in July, may start coming to the floor in July, as we know, if we have a robust, open process for appropriations bills, typically you might have 100 amendments on a given appropriations bill, and so many times we have late-night votes. We have 2-minute votes because, if Congress is truly going to process those amendments in an orderly way, even 15-minute votes or 5-minute votes haven't worked. So we went to a 2-minute voting schedule.

You can't do that if we have proxy voting because, as the gentleman knows, it does eat up a lot more time and delays our ability to move through a normal appropriations process.

So looking toward that, the July 3 date is there. If it expires, as we hope it does, I think that would help Congress to more effectively work through some of the big bills that we have on our calendar ahead. I know you all will be considering that. I think the gentleman knows where we are and what we would hope happens.

I do want to ask about some of the crises that we are seeing around the country. You look at inflation continuing to be a growing problem. We had in our committee the Federal Reserve Chairman Powell just a few days ago, who talked about the concerns with 5 percent inflation we continue to see.

Whether it is gasoline prices, double-digit increases, everything we buy at the grocery, you are starting to see larger increases in costs for grocery items. Housing, if you are just trying to buy a house, to renovate your house, those costs are higher. If you want an appliance, you might have to wait for 6 months.

Much of that is because of the labor shortage. Every small business you talk to says the biggest impediment they have to getting their businesses back up again is that the Federal Government is paying people more money not to work than to go back to work. When you have millions of job openings, it doesn't seem to make sense that we are allowing people to be paid not to work when businesses are trying and struggling to get back on their feet from this pandemic.

I don't know if there is an anticipation to bring legislation to start confronting some of those problems.

Clearly, we see the Vice President at the border today. While she is not at

the areas of the border where you see the biggest increases in illegal crossings, we know that there is a crisis in the United States. And it is not just people in South and Central America coming across. We are seeing people from Middle Eastern countries. There have been people on the terrorist watch list who are coming. I hope that as she comes back from that trip—hopefully she has met with Border Patrol agents.

People have told us what the problems are. The President could address all of this today by reversing some of his executive actions that have opened the border. But if he doesn't, I hope Congress would look at bringing legislation to confront a lot of those challenges that I talked about.

I am not sure if you all anticipate bringing bills like that, but I would ask the gentleman if he had any comment on that.

Madam Speaker, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

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

As you mention, we were on it this week with the presence of Chairman Powell at our select subcommittee hearing. Chairman Powell made two things very clear to us.

Number one, he says it would be a big mistake to put the brakes on too soon; that we must allow families to get back on their feet, communities to get restored. And he advised against us doing anything too soon.

He also made it very clear that if he and the Fed were to make some determination that inflation is becoming a problem, the Fed could deal with it.

You may recall that he indicated that a lot of the price increases have come about as a result of bottlenecks that have existed in the system as people are gearing back up, and he thinks that is going to be temporary. He also feels that if it looks like this is going to go beyond being temporary, that he has the tools to make the kind of adjustments that are at least necessary to keep the economy flowing and to keep inflation in check.

I think that on my side of the aisle, we are very comfortable following the advice of Chairman Powell, and I would hope that this is an issue that will not get politicized. We need to get this country back on track. We need to get families back in touch with each other. We need to keep this country moving in a positive way. So I think we are going to wait and take advice from Chairman Powell on whether we should do anything legislatively to deal with that issue.

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

As we know, the Federal Reserve Chairman has some tools available to him, if need be, to address problems in the economy that we are starting to see, but we also know that those tools are very harsh. Hopefully, those tools would be a last resort.

So it is important for us, as policymakers, to not just sit back and wait

for problems to occur that then the Federal Reserve Chairman has to address because we haven't. Because we know if he does those things, whether it is limiting money supply, interest rate increases, those are all things that would hurt hardworking families all across the country.

So as he even recognized, right now the enhanced unemployment benefits that are, by all accounts, the reason that we are having a worker shortage, the reason that every small business is having trouble getting more people back to work so they can meet that supply demand that is starting to create inflation, he did acknowledge that when those enhanced benefits run out, then you will see the worker shortage get better and improve and people start going back to work.

We could end those earlier, acknowledging there are millions of job openings. We shouldn't be paying people money to not work when there are jobs that are available right now and they can't find takers.

What we have seen is a majority of States now have said: We are going to end those benefits on our own so that people can get back to work, so that we can get our economies moving.

Many large States—Florida, Texas, Tennessee, and many other States—by the end of next week will do that.

I am proud that yesterday in my State, our Governor, who is a Democrat, signed a bill working with Republicans to end our enhanced unemployment benefits in Louisiana by the end of July.

□ 1115

He acknowledged, as a Democrat, that you can work together, and that this is a problem, so let's address this problem. While States are addressing it, some are not. Many have.

But, hopefully, Congress can look at ways where we can address some of these problems earlier so that it doesn't fall in the lap of the Federal Reserve Chairman, and then he has to take harsh steps to deal with the problems that we should be fixing as we see them coming.

I yield to the gentleman if he has anything else. That is all I have.

Mr. CLYBURN. I assure you that, in my instance, my Governor is a Republican. In fact, he was the first Governor to endorse the previous President. But we are very close friends, and we have been in consultation over what to do as we go forward.

I am working very closely with him and working very closely with other Governors, as well. I think that each State is unique when it comes to how to stand back up as we go forward.

I am proud that Louisiana is moving in the right direction. I applaud John Bel Edwards for working closely with you. I assure you that I am working just as close with the Governor of South Carolina and other Governors to make sure we do what is necessary to apply our efforts in such a way that it

won't cause problems for States as they stand back up.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that because I work well with our Governor. We might not see eye to eye on everything, but Governor John Bel Edwards is addressing those problems adequately. He worked with the Republican legislature. They got an agreement, and it was a good agreement.

I know you have a good relationship with your Governor. You and I have a good relationship. Hopefully, we can use those good relationships to prove people wrong who look at Congress and say: Why can't they get agreements on things?

Again, we are seeing some positive movement on the Senate side. I haven't seen the details, and the details are very, very important. But, hopefully, on these big issues, we can work together and build those relationships so that we can actually solve these problems and solve them in a way that doesn't harm families, where it could end up in a harsh place if we don't confront those problems. I know we will be talking more about that in the future.

If the gentleman is not the one doing the colloquy in the future—we hope the majority leader is back—I have enjoyed this colloquy with you. We, obviously, enjoy our relationship on many fronts, but it has been a pleasure to work with you on the colloquy.

Hopefully, the majority leader is here next time, and he has big shoes to fill. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for his friendship and kind remarks today. But I am looking forward to the majority leader coming back and taking his rightful place at this mike. The gentleman and I can continue our relationship with the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis and in other areas around the Capitol.

Mr. SCALISE. He will probably be moving around even faster. I will not challenge him to a race. I am not quite where he is yet, but I am working to get there.

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

#### INVESTING IN AMERICA'S RECOVERY

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, nearly 40 percent of Americans before COVID couldn't cover an unexpected \$400 expense without selling belongings or going into debt. And no one pays a greater price for poverty than our kids.

I am proud of our work to pass the American Rescue Plan and deliver a lifeline for millions of struggling Americans. Starting July 15, that lifeline gets stronger.

In a few weeks, and again every month throughout 2021, hardworking families will get a check of up to \$400