

Carter (LA) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Case Johnson (TX)
 Casten Jones
 Castor (FL) Kahele
 Castro (TX) Kaptur
 Cherfilus-Keating
 McCormick Kelly (IL)
 Chu Khanna
 Cicilline Kildee
 Clark (MA) Kilmer
 Clarke (NY) Kim (NJ)
 Cleaver Kind
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick
 Cohen Krishnamoorthi
 Connolly Kuster
 Cooper Lamb
 Correa Langevin
 Costa Larsen (WA)
 Courtney Larson (CT)
 Craig Lawrence
 Crow Lawson (FL)
 Cuellar Lee (CA)
 Davids (KS) Lee (NV)
 Davis, Danny K. Leger Fernandez
 Dean Levin (CA)
 DeFazio Levin (MI)
 DeGette Lieu
 DeLauro Lofgren
 DelBene Lowenthal
 Demings Luria
 DeSaulnier Lynch
 Deutch Mace
 Dingell Malinowski
 Doggett Maloney,
 Doyle, Michael Carolyn B.
 F. Maloney, Sean
 Escobar Manning
 Eshoo Matsui
 Espallat McBath
 Evans McCollum
 Fitzpatrick McEachin
 Fletcher McGovern
 Foster McNerney
 Frankel, Lois Meeks
 Gallego Meng
 Garamendi Mfume
 Garcia (IL) Moore (WI)
 Garcia (TX) Morelle
 Golden Moulton
 Gomez Mirvan
 Gonzalez, Vicente Murphy (FL)
 Gottheimer Nadler
 Green, Al (TX) Napolitano
 Grijalva Neal
 Harder (CA) Neguse
 Hayes Newman
 Higgins (NY) Norcross
 Himes O'Halleran
 Horsford Ocasio-Cortez
 Houlahan Omar
 Hoyer Pallone
 Huffman Panetta
 Jackson Lee Pappas
 Jacobs (CA) Payne
 Jayapal Peltola
 Perlmutter

NAYS—203

Aderholt Carter (GA)
 Allen Carter (TX)
 Amodei Cawthorn
 Armstrong Chabot
 Arrington Cline
 Babin Cloud
 Bacon Clyde
 Baird Cole
 Balderson Comer
 Banks Conway
 Barr Crawford
 Bentz Crenshaw
 Bergman Curtis
 Bice (OK) Davidson
 Biggs Davis, Rodney
 Bilirakis DesJarlais
 Bishop (NC) Diaz-Balart
 Boebert Donalds
 Bost Duncan
 Brady Dunn
 Brooks Ellzey
 Buchanan Emmer
 Buck Estes
 Bucshon Fallon
 Burchett Feenstra
 Burgess Ferguson
 Calvert Finstad
 Cammack Fischbach
 Carey Fitzgerald
 Carl Fleischmann

Peters
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Ross
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (NY)
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Flood
 Flores
 Foxx
 Franklin, C.
 Scott
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Garbarino
 Garcia (CA)
 Gibbs
 Gimenez
 Gohmert
 Gonzales, Tony
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Good (VA)
 Gooden (TX)
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Greene (GA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Harris
 Harshbarger
 Hartzler
 Hern

Herrrell
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Hinson
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Issa
 Jackson
 Jacobs (NY)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Katko
 Keller
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kim (CA)
 Kustoff
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Lesko
 Letlow
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Malliotakis
 Mann
 Massie

Budd
 Cheney
 Fulcher

Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClain
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Meijer
 Meuser
 Miller (IL)
 Miller (WV)
 Miller-Meeks
 Moolenaar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Mullin
 Nehls
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Obernolte
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Pfluger
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Salazar

NOT VOTING—8

Kinzinger
 Murphy (NC)
 Pascrell
 Rodgers (WA)
 Williams (TX)

□ 1539

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Johnson (TX)	Pingree (Kuster)
Barragán (Beyer)	(Jeffries)	Rice (NY)
Bass (Correa)	Jones (Beyer)	(Deutch)
Brooks	Khanna (Jeffries)	Rush (Bowman)
(Fleischmann)	Kilmer (Jeffries)	Ryan (OH)
Bush (Bowman)	Kirkpatrick	(Correa)
Carter (GA)	(Pallone)	Sánchez
(Mace)	Lawson (FL)	(Pallone)
Cawthorn	(Evans)	Schiff (Deutch)
(Boebert)	McCaul (Van	Scott (VA)
Cleaver (Davids	Duyn)	(Beyer)
(KS))	McEachin	Scott, Austin
Conway	(Beyer)	(Cammack)
(Valadao)	Moore (WI)	Stansbury
Cuellar (Garcia	(Beyer)	(Pallone)
(TX))	Newman (Beyer)	Swalwell
DeSaulnier	Norman	(Correa)
(Beyer)	(Duncan)	Wasserman
Dingell (Kuster)	Palazzo	Schultz (Soto)
Fallon (Nehls)	(Fleischmann)	Wexton (Beyer)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 8824

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Representative FITZPATRICK be removed as cosponsor from H.R. 8824.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Louisiana).

There was no objection.

□ 1545

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is my friend and the majority leader of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, and votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

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

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

Next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider S. 1098, the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act, bipartisan legislation sponsored by Representative DAVID PRICE and Senator MARK WARNER to provide relief to borrowers who need to separate their joint consolidation student loans. This legislation would greatly benefit the individual borrowers who are most in need of relief, including victims of abuse.

The House may also consider a continuing resolution. As all of us know, on September 30, at midnight, the government's ability to fund and operate goes out of authorization; therefore, it is necessary for us to take action before September 30, and we may do that next week.

The House may also consider legislation to reform the Electoral Count Act from Representatives ZOE LOFGREN and LIZ CHENEY.

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

As is usual, as we come very close to ending and then have a substantial period of time, October and the first and second week in November for the election, it is common that we may have other pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker, available and necessary to pass. We will notify Members as soon as we have that information.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCALISE. As it relates to the continuing resolution that I know the gentleman said may come up, we haven't had any details that have been shown to us on what that might look like in terms of other items in addition to some kind of short-term or even what the duration of a short term would be.

If there are any dates that the majority has already started thinking about that would be included in a continuing

resolution, any extraneous items—there is some other funding that has been thrown about. There has been talk about Senator MANCHIN, that there may be some agreement that Senator MANCHIN would have some kind of permitting reform. I am not sure if that would be a part of a continuing resolution or a stand-alone bill.

If the gentleman could provide any clarification on any of those items that we haven't been privy to in conversations, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Obviously, that is a good question and a good thing to have.

The appropriators are working through the administration's list of anomalies, which I know there are three or four items dealing with health and also dealing with Ukraine and a couple of other matters. I don't have that list in front of me, but the answer to my friend's question is that they are trying to get that together.

I think they are pretty close. I will talk to Chair DELAUNO. I presume she is in conversation with and discussions with the ranking member, as well, but I am sure that that is the case.

There is also, I believe, money also being asked for for disaster relief that may well be in the CR.

The gentleman referred to the discussions that occurred in the Senate between Senator MANCHIN and Majority Leader SCHUMER. Obviously, we are going to see what the Senate does. I don't know what the Senate is going to do. It is one of the reasons there has been a discussion about the Senate moving first on that and discussions with the Senator about when they were going to move. I think that is under discussion.

Mr. SCALISE. Obviously, we will be staying in touch on that. Hopefully, Ms. LOFGREN will have some conversations with Ms. GRANGER about details because we haven't seen those yet. We surely would like to be more involved in those discussions.

Mr. HOYER. If I might add, I want to make the gentleman aware—and I know he is—but I want to make the Members aware that we will need to be here for such time as it takes us to pass the continuing resolution so that government will continue to operate. It is essential for the economy, essential for our national security, and essential for the employees, but it is also essential for all those whom they serve on a daily basis.

I have told my Members in some discussions about what we are going to do the last week in September. I have told my Members, and we also would make clear to all of our Members, including the Members on my friend's side of the aisle, that they ought to be making sure that the last 3 weekdays of November and that Saturday they ought to keep clear so that if, in fact, we need to work during those periods of times—and my expectation is we are going to have to—that they not be canceling events that they scheduled. So, being

on notice, I think, will be fair to them and fair to anybody that we are scheduling with.

Mr. SCALISE. As we are more in the first half of September, obviously, this would all be at the very end of September. Hopefully, we wouldn't wait until the midnight hour. We are all aware of the deadline.

Hopefully, we can get something brought, ideally agreed upon by both sides, which we are nowhere near right now, but at least to have more direct conversations well in advance of the deadline, so we are not here watching the clock strike midnight wondering.

Mr. HOYER. I could not agree with the gentleman more. I think I am probably just as frustrated.

I know the members of the Appropriations Committee are as frustrated as anybody in this institution. As someone who served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years, we ought to be passing bills in a timely fashion. We ought to be passing them one at a time. We ought not to have these gigantic omnibuses that nobody knows about.

Both sides have had to prepare two omnibuses at the end of the year to fund government because we haven't passed individual appropriation bills in a timely fashion either through the House or the Senate or through the House and the Senate to the President. So, I agree with the gentleman entirely.

I agree also that we ought to give everybody as much notice as we possibly can. I will tell the gentleman, frankly, I was hopeful that we would have passed the CR this week. For reasons that are, I think, obvious to everybody, we haven't done that. But I am hopeful that we can do it sooner rather than later and don't have some September 30 crisis that we seem to always create.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, we can start seeing actual language next week so we can either get to a place where we are in agreement or try to resolve those areas of disagreement.

As the gentleman was talking about the calendar and other items that may be coming up, I noticed there were no conversations about any of the legislation that we have been talking about bringing to the floor to address inflation.

We just saw Tuesday, as the President was holding a party at the White House to celebrate inflation, we saw, yet again, more devastating news on the inflation front, to the point where the markets tanked during that party at the White House.

We have a package of bills that would help bring down inflation, bring down energy costs, and help those families who are struggling as we get ready to face another cold winter. There are expectations right now by all the experts that energy costs will go up again because we have limited supply here in the country.

As we identify those bills and yet not see any of them being listed for debate

on the House floor, can we try to get some kind of direction on whether this majority will work with us to bring bills to the floor to address these real problems that are hurting families all across the country?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I, obviously, anticipated that question. I thought about it, and I want to say to the Members my thoughts that I, frankly, talk about all over the country.

We passed a number of bills. Inflation is hurting our people. Inflation was not caused by President Biden or this Congress. Inflation was caused by the pandemic.

Inflation hurt businesses severely and hurt employees severely. In a bipartisan way, we voted as that pandemic started. As we saw the broad impacts of that, we, in a bipartisan fashion, stepped in to help. It made a very big difference.

I start that way because the representation of some is that somehow we, by passing legislation, have caused this inflation. The OECD nations, the economically developed countries of the world, have all had inflation. As a matter of fact, the average OECD nation has a 10.2 percent inflation rate. As the gentleman knows, ours is 8.3 percent.

Mexico didn't have any of the bills that we passed and had an 8.7 inflation rate. The Netherlands that didn't have an American Rescue Plan has a 13.6 percent rate of inflation. Sweden, a small and very successful country, didn't have an American Rescue Plan and has an inflation rate of 9.8 percent; Austria, another strong economic country, 9.3 percent; Denmark, the country of my father's birth, 8.9 percent.

And you say: So what? The "so what" is that we have seen a global inflation. I haven't mentioned some of the other countries in Asia who have inflation rates, as well. I simply say that so both parties and all Members understand the consequences and pain of inflation at the pump.

The gentleman in some of the discussions we have had has pointed out that prices have gone up. I have not heard him say that the President has taken certain action, and it has come down about 35-plus percent over the last 6, 7 weeks from \$5.02 as an average down to somewhere around \$3.60.

Is that low enough? It is not. It has been much higher. It was higher in 2008 under George Bush. But it needs to come down further. We will continue to work on that.

We passed a number of pieces of legislation. I mentioned the American Rescue Plan took 48 percent of America's children out of poverty who were in poverty; not 48 percent of America's children, but 48 percent of America's children who were in poverty were taken out by the American Rescue Plan.

None of us are wearing masks on this floor or around the country when we gather together and get in rooms close to one another. Why? Because we got 250 million shots in arms.

We also have people struggling for a variety of economic reasons primarily brought upon them by the pandemic, so we put money in their pockets.

We have one of the fastest growing economies. We have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the world. We have a country that is doing well.

The gentleman mentions the stock market declining. It did. Why did it decline? Because we had the pandemic. Inflation resulted from that, and the Federal Reserve—as was true under Ronald Reagan when unemployment went to 10.5, 6, 7, 8 percent because Paul Volcker was slowing down the economy to defeat inflation.

Inflation is harmful, particularly to people who are elderly and on fixed incomes. So, I want the gentleman to know that we empathize with that, and, therefore, we are distressed.

When we passed a bill, the Inflation Reduction Act, not a single Republican voted for it.

□ 1600

And there is absolutely no denial on the reality that is going to bring Americans' costs down. Not only that, it kept 13 million people who were going to fall off insurance on the Affordable Care Act—which I know the gentleman's party does not support—but 13 million Americans who had healthcare insurance as a result of the American Rescue Plan, it was going to stop on December 31, and we continued that.

We put on legislation that would bring down prescription drug costs and allow companies to sell drugs to Medicare in a negotiated way. We negotiate, as the gentleman knows, and I don't know whether the gentleman thinks that policy ought to be stopped, but we negotiated for prices with veterans' healthcare. Now we are going to do it with Medicare. We wanted to do it for everybody, but the Senate Republicans would not agree to that.

We believe that the infrastructure bill is going to really help bring down inflation, create jobs, and expand our economy. We believe the CHIPS and Science bill is going to do the same. Only 13 on the Republican side voted for the infrastructure bill, which was, I think, a bill that would have helped inflation by making supplies better. The energy portion of the Inflation Reduction Act is going to bring down the cost of energy. It is going to create competition on energy, and fight climate change. I lament the fact that not a single Republican voted for the Inflation Reduction Act.

Even if you reject the fact that it is going to reduce inflation—as I think you probably do, I don't want to anticipate what you do, but that is my guess. There are literally scores of economists who believe it is going to bring down inflation.

As importantly, the committee who looks closely at this—scores of economists say it is going to bring it down. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget say they believe it is going to bring down inflation. I don't want to project that it is going to bring it down a half a point, a point, 2 points, 3 points, 4 points—I hope it does. I think it was certainly worth a try.

None of your colleagues either in this House or in the Senate—down the aisle—gave it a chance. We passed it anyway under a process, obviously, that allows just Democrats in the Senate to pass something under a process called reconciliation.

I want to tell the gentleman that I have apprised the committee chairmen of the bills that you have talked to me about. I have asked them to look at them. Frankly, I cannot tell you I have gotten a response from each one of them, but we are giving them attention.

Obviously, we want to know what our committees think about not only your legislation, our legislation—our legislation, that is, bipartisan legislation. We lament the fact, I will tell you, very frankly, Mr. Speaker—we lament the fact that our Republican colleagues in all four of the bills I have just mentioned, which are designed to grow the economy—the CHIPS bill, the bipartisan infrastructure—19 Senators voted for the infrastructure bill and helped put it together with President Biden and Senate Democrats. Lamentably, only 13 of your colleagues chose to vote for it. I am glad they did, but it was over the advice and counsel of their leadership. That bill clearly was embraced by the American people and incorporated policies, essentially, that President Trump said in 2016 he was going to recommend and have the Congress adopt. It didn't happen in 2017. It didn't happen in 2018. It didn't happen in 2019, and it didn't happen in 2020.

I say to my friend, we think all four of those bills are going to have a very positive impact on our economy, on growing our economy, ensuring supplies of basic goods, and bringing down inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of different bills the gentleman mentioned. Each one of them, by the way, when you rack them up, adds up to trillions of dollars in new spending. If trillions in Washington spending were going to solve the problem, then we would have no inflation.

Obviously, it has gone the opposite direction, and it is going the opposite direction because of the trillions of dollars in new spending if you go down the line. Obviously, the gentleman went through all of those things, and I would like to respond to a number of them because it just doesn't mesh with the realities of where our economy is today.

If you look at the numbers—and we can talk about other countries—other

countries have passed bad policies that have wrecked their economies. You can see Europe right now finally having a renewed debate on energy policy because they passed some really foolish energy policies that are destroying their energy economies and making them more dependent on Russia, for example, to get their oil and to get their natural gas. They are finally waking up.

A lot of them shut their nuclear plants down, which is safe, sound nuclear energy. They wrecked their economies. They are starting to reverse that. I am glad they are finally waking up and reversing course.

It seems like right here in Washington the failed policies that President Biden has put in place, they want to double down on. When you look at the results of it, that is why we get where we are which is double digit increases in food costs that our families are facing. Electricity costs over 15 percent higher just over the last year, and it is about to get worse because the bill that the President was celebrating at the White House had another increase in taxes on natural gas, which will raise those costs even higher.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I can't see the chart. Could you tell me what it says so I know what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, electricity rates are 15.8 percent higher than last year.

Mr. HOYER. Here?

Mr. SCALISE. In America. This is all in America. Families that we represent are facing the burden of all of these policies that started in Washington that are ultimately ending up taking money out of their pockets.

When you go to the grocery store—if you can afford to get there—if you find the food on the shelves, it is 13½ percent higher. We have seen the list, whether it is eggs, dairy products, bacon, some of them are 30 percent higher individually, but it adds up to about 13½ percent more that you are paying at the grocery store.

Mortgage rates. If somebody is trying to become a first-time home buyer, which is part of the American dream, today it is 110 percent higher to get a mortgage than it was a year ago. Most economists, including many Democrat economists, point to the trillions in spending in Washington as the reason for that. Families have figured this out and said: Stop the madness.

Yet, again, at the White House in the most tone-deaf thing I have seen in a while, the President is having a party celebrating a \$730 billion increase in taxes and spending at the exact same time that the market is tanking because of the inflation created by all this spending.

To finish it up, transportation costs are 11.3 percent higher. That is what is happening in America.

Again, Europe did a lot of these same bad policies. They figured it out, and

they are starting to reverse course. They just got rid of their Prime Minister in England because of what they did to wreck their energy economy.

We brought bills—as I shared with the gentleman over months—we have brought a number of bills forward that would solve these problems, and not one of them has been scheduled for a vote on the House floor. We want to address this problem. We don't just sit back and go: Well, it is happening in other countries, so let it stay racking up in America. It doesn't need to.

These are all unforced errors that are the result of failed policies, and instead of stopping the failed policies and working with Republicans to turn it around and lower these costs, it seems like there is a desire to just double down and talk about trillions more to spend.

If spending was solving the problems, then we would have none of these problems. The problems have gotten worse with each multi-trillion or multi-hundred-billion-dollar package of legislation that has come out of this body.

At some point, I would hope that the other side would look and recognize and say, okay, forget about Europe and Asia. They need to look in the mirror and say, why did they create some of their problems?

We can do something about these problems. We brought those ideas forward, and every single time we have been told no, which must mean that this is okay. Because this is not okay to us, and there is a way to reverse it.

If just spending more money and having parties at the White House to celebrate that spending while Rome is burning is where we are going to be, I think there is going to be a day of reckoning on that. I don't think the country is comfortable where we are. And when the idea is to just keep spending more money and act like—maybe it is another \$5 trillion—what is the number that is going to finally get us out of this mess? If it was trillions, we would be there already.

Maybe, just maybe, we need to look at going the other way. Stop paying people not to work, for example, when everybody is looking for workers. Unfortunately, the IRS is looking for 87,000 more people. And as CBO just confirmed, a lot of that is going to be going after hardworking families, families making under \$400,000 a year, even though we were promised on this floor that wouldn't happen.

We brought an amendment to ensure that President Biden's promise would be upheld. We brought an amendment that would say and ensure no American making under \$400,000 would see their taxes go up with these 87,000 new IRS agents. The majority rejected that amendment. Literally, the day of the vote, the Congressional Budget Office came out and confirmed that it is over \$20 billion in new taxes.

That bill is going to cost families making less than \$400,000. Those families are already struggling. They would

love to save up and buy a new house. They can't even afford to get to the grocery store to pay 13½ percent more. If they try to go get a mortgage today, they are going to be paying more than double for that mortgage than they were a year ago.

At some point we have got to stop these failed policies that are causing these problems. Go look at what some of these other countries are doing to finally reverse course because they are, and they need to, but so do we. I would hope that we would bring some of those bills to the House floor because we could start reversing these horrible trends now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

First, let me say, the gentleman dismisses what other countries are doing or he says they are doing bad things and therefore they have inflation.

Every country has inflation. Why? Because the pandemic shut down the world. It shut down the markets. It shut down the production of supplies. That is why. People had to stay home and they weren't out producing and making things.

We kept a lot of people employed. We spent trillions of dollars doing it, which were bipartisan bills signed by Donald Trump. Trillions. As soon as Donald Trump left, all of a sudden the other party—his party, the Trump party, decided it is over. It wasn't over for the American people.

Kids were not in schools. People hadn't been given shots in arms yet. People were really hurting. Those 48 percent of the children in poverty were still in poverty, but it was over. No more bipartisanship. It is another President, so we are going to blame him.

That is politics over people. What we did is people over politics because we knew people were hurting. We passed legislation to give them help. Every Republican, Mr. Speaker, voted no.

We voted to help them get shots in arms. Every Republican voted no.

We voted to get their kids back in school to make their schools safe and healthy. Every Republican voted no because they wanted to bleat about inflation.

The reason they don't like these figures is because these are the economically successful nations of the world, many of whom have inflation higher than we.

The gentleman is absolutely right. We need to get inflation down. There are 126 economists that say that the Inflation Reduction Act will reduce inflation, reduce healthcare costs, and reduce energy costs.

Now, the gentleman and I have had this discussion about his energy bills, which they think will be the salvation. They always think: Drill more, life will be better. I get it. Louisiana is a State that wants to drill. I get that. We use that product. It is an important prod-

uct, and we are going to continue to use it. That is why I have no criticism of that.

In the last bill that we passed, which is really going to fight the climate challenge that we face—there were four 1,000-year floods in four different communities in America within 30 days of one another.

□ 1615

The West is on fire, literally and figuratively. Climate challenge is real. Every Republican voted "no" to invest in meeting that challenge head-on; every Republican, House and Senate, Mr. Speaker.

I can't read the chart, but 13 percent inflation is too high. I go to the grocery store almost every weekend. I live alone. I don't buy a lot of food at any one time because I am traveling a lot and here a lot; don't want it to go bad.

So I get it on the prices. I get it on gasoline prices. They are tough. That is why we passed a food and fuel bill. The gentleman from Louisiana voted "no." The leader of the Republican Party, Mr. McCARTHY, in the House, voted "no", and the overwhelming majority of Republicans voted "no."

They wanted to make sure that we had competition. That is the free market system. That is what brings prices down. If you have a monopoly, you can charge anything you want if people need the product.

Now, I won't go through the statistics because the statistics are we are producing more energy today than we produced 2 years ago. I read those statistics. I am not going to bore the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, with them again.

They don't bore me because it shows that—when the argument is the reason we have inflation is because we are not producing energy, the reason we don't have as much energy is because companies made a rational decision. What was that rational decision?

In March and April of 2020, people started staying in their homes. They stopped buying gas and other products, petroleum products, and, as a result, corporations made a reasonable judgment. We are not going to produce more capacity.

So, when we got out of the inflation, we are still not doing that. But we are doing more than we did some years ago, as those statistics that I read to the gentleman three or four times, so I won't read them again.

But the industry, as I have also told the gentleman, owns 9,000 unused permits to drill onshore; 37 million acres offshore; which can be permitted, ready to go.

So when you simply ignore and pretend that somehow Joe Biden, the President of the United States, is responsible for worldwide inflation, and dismiss the pandemic—I don't think I have heard one time, Mr. Speaker, the Republican whip mention the pandemic as a cause of the inflation. It is all about energy.

I beg to differ with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I think, honestly, the American people need to know that.

Yes, the stock market had a rough tumble. Why did it have a rough tumble? Because the Federal Reserve, the chairman of which was appointed by President Trump, responsibly, along with his board of governors, responded to try to get this inflation under control and bring it down.

I don't know whether the gentleman supports that action or not. Ronald Reagan supported that action; although he did not appoint the chairman of the Federal Reserve that did it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to fight for the people and put them above our politics, or even our own personal economic interests, by passing the American Rescue Plan; by passing the bipartisan infrastructure bill; by making sure that America can be seen as a country that makes it in America; chips, investing in science for the future, for the people and, yes, the Inflation Reduction Act, which the gentleman and his party has misrepresented over and over and over again with something they know is not the truth.

They project 80,000 new people going after average Americans. They know that is not true, Mr. Speaker.

After years of trying to defund the people who collect the revenues from our people so everybody pays their fair share, and those of us—and I say of us—who are doing well, pay our fair share, and the people who make billions, who pay less of a percentage, in many respects, as Warren Buffett said, than those who work for them.

Yes, we want taxes fairly enforced, Mr. Speaker. We don't want anybody paying an unfair share because somebody is not paying at all.

The IRS will, after those 10 years of accretion of employees, have as many employees as it had back in the 1990s; trying to make sure it can, in fact, enforce a fair system that provides the revenues that the Federal Government needs to protect, preserve our people's welfare, economy, and national security.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, first, to clarify, it wasn't me who said that the IRS agents, this new army of 87,000 IRS agents, would be going after people to collect \$20 billion more in taxes who were making less than \$400,000.

It was the Congressional Budget Office who put in their report the day of the vote that that is exactly what would happen, is that those IRS agents would, in fact, be going after people making less than \$400,000, to the tune of \$20 billion in new taxes.

We brought an amendment to stop that from happening, to say they can't go after those people making less than \$400,000, which is what the President promised. The Congressional Budget Office report was right there, saying \$20 billion is what they would pay in new taxes. The majority rejected the amendment. So clearly, the intention was to have those IRS agents go after them.

Again, those weren't my numbers. That was the Congressional Budget Of-

fice. If there is a dispute the gentleman has, take it up with them. But they were the ones who came out with that report the day of the vote. Maybe that was why the bill was rushed through. But we pointed that out, and no one disputed that the Congressional Budget Office put those numbers out there.

But the President still kept saying, don't worry. They are not going to go after them, not a dime. But CBO said \$20 billion in new taxes those low- and middle-income families will pay. We tried to stop it. The majority rejected it.

Now, to go to the oil and gas comments the gentleman made about President Biden, you would think, listening to your comments, that Joe Biden was John D. Rockefeller, and he is drilling everywhere. Well, let's first—

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I made that comment.

Mr. SCALISE. And I won't say the gentleman did, but as the gentleman talked about all this production and drilling that is going on and all this oil that is coming out, it was Joe Biden who said, as a candidate, "no more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore. No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period."

Then he carried out policies to back that up and stop drilling.

We have pointed out many times, major companies in America that want to increase production, as the gentleman did say, that they are not increasing production. They tried, and they have been rejected on the permits they would need.

You can't just go drill a new hole tomorrow. Every well ultimately depletes. We all know that. That has been going on since man invented the ability to drill for oil in the world. So as oil depletes, you need to get new permits to go into these areas. The Biden administration, over and over again, rejected those new permits.

So there are leases out there. Again, a lease might be like you have a car. You have got a car in your driveway. Well, if you don't have an engine in the car, the car is not functional.

If you have a lease, the lease doesn't do you any good if you can't get the permits to build pipelines. We have talked about the pipeline problems as this administration, over and over again, has blocked new pipelines.

How do you move the oil? How do you get the permit to go and explore for more?

So what the President did—again, if we were just maxed out on drilling here, why did the President get on Air Force One and fly 5,700 miles to Saudi Arabia to beg them to produce more oil? They said no because they don't have the ability over there.

The President called Vladimir Putin and asked him to drill for more oil. Putin said no.

You don't need to ask those countries to produce more oil because we

have it here, but there is documented evidence, over and over, where this administration has said no to permits, no to the ability for us to produce more of our own energy.

So what happens? The price goes up. They are talking about, during this winter, the inability for people to have home heating oil. So they are importing it from countries like Russia because they are not allowing more production here, where companies are trying to produce more and being turned down by this administration.

The Secretary—I think it was the Secretary of Energy—when asked, what is your plan to produce more in America, she started laughing. It is not a laughing matter, but that has been the attitude of this administration.

To finish up on the point where the gentleman started talking about all these bills that we voted against, starting with the \$1.9 trillion spending bill that this administration came right out of the box with. As the economy was starting to turn around, and people were starting to bring workers back, trying to get workers back, a \$1.9 trillion package of bills came forward to pay people, in part, not to work, to stay at home; made it harder for people to get workers back.

But what it also did—and this is something we brought up during the debate—checks were being sent to people.

Well, we pointed out that checks were going to end up going to people in prisons, and we were told that wasn't going to happen. Just like with the 87,000 IRS agents, when CBO debunked that. Don't worry; nobody in prison is going to get checks. Turned out later, the Boston bomber got a check.

Who knows how many billions of dollars went to prisoners to be paid—taxpayers are already paying for them to be housed, to be fed, to get healthcare. But then they also got checks, actual checks in stimulus money. We had an amendment to stop that from happening.

But ultimately, yes, we voted against those things because we wanted to see our economy back open.

When there was this idea that everybody had to stay home, that wasn't the case when we started last year. In fact, many States started to open again. There were some States that stayed shut down.

By the way, you can see a massive movement around the country, where New York State alone lost about a million people who moved to States like Florida because they didn't want to be shut down anymore when there was a State that was open, following safety protocols, protecting their people, but allowing people to live in freedom again and live their lives.

So people moved out of States, the shut down States like California and New York and moved to States that were open. You can see the numbers, and they are dramatic numbers.

So not every State handled it the same. But the States that opened were

having a lot more success in protecting their people at the same time, but the States that stayed closed had devastating consequences.

Not to mention what we saw with children being shut out of school, the learning that wasn't happening. Those are devastating numbers we are seeing today because this administration changed the science—and that is documented—changed the science over at CDC to cater to the unions who wanted to keep schools shut down. So millions of kids didn't learn at the levels they should have, and those numbers are still showing up today, that those kids were left behind; lost a year or 2 years they will never get back because other kids were in school learning, when the unions wanted to work with the Biden administration to keep schools shut down.

So those are the things that we tried to address. None of those bills were allowed to come to the floor. But that is where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

First of all, to your last statement, the unions. What were the unions trying to do? They were trying to keep teachers healthy. They were trying to keep kids healthy. Because we were telling people, don't congregate. Don't get all together.

They were trying to keep kids out of school whose HVAC systems, heating, ventilating systems were not up to date and couldn't transfer the air in a clean, healthy way.

So we gave them billions of dollars. Yes, we spent a lot of money to make our people safe, to get people back to work, to get kids back in school, and it worked. They are back in school.

None of us are wearing a mask. We congregate now. We all get together. Hardly anybody, if anybody, some people who have particular vulnerabilities are wearing masks. God bless them. It worked, and the Republicans voted "no."

□ 1630

Now, I want to go to this energy issue because they are Johnny-one-note. Inflation is caused by administration policy on inflation, gas prices, and energy production. But the fact of the matter is he ignores that inflation is happening in a lot of places.

Mr. Speaker, in Denmark, they are pretty energy independent with renewable energies and not relying on supply chains per se. Their inflation is higher than ours because it was a global phenomenon. Their economies were assaulted. Ours came back faster and better.

Why? Because we invested in our people.

Now, let me go to a simple fact. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, average production—that means over 4 years for Trump—for Donald Trump was 10,968,000 barrels per

day; for Joe Biden it was 11,185,000 barrels a day. That is more, not less, than the average under Donald Trump. But it serves their political interest, Mr. Speaker, to somehow project to the American people that Biden has shut down the energy industry which is why you are paying more.

I explained that the energy companies did, in fact, cut production. It was a rational business judgment. People were driving less and buying less petroleum.

There is still concern. Most of them are seeing that there is going to be an alternative energy that is going to be required if we are going to make sure that this globe does not burn up with the people with it.

He also says—I don't have the report in front of me, so I am going to wing it—that no one earning under \$400,000 per year got a tax increase as a result of the bill the gentleman alludes to.

If CBO says—and I will read the report—that \$20 billion is going to be received from that category, it will be because somebody, whether they are making \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000, or \$400,000, is not paying their fair share pursuant to laws that we adopt—not because we put new taxes on them but because they are not paying the taxes that are due.

I don't have the CBO report in front of me, so I am opining because it certainly wasn't because we have new enforcement officers, unless those enforcement officers find that the people to which the gentleman refers are not paying their fair share.

By the way, it will also apply to the people who are making billions and not paying any taxes, much less their fair share.

Let me repeat that energy figure again because I think he will probably go back to energy because that is what we do almost every colloquy. More energy is being produced under Joe Biden than was produced under Donald Trump.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if Joe Biden wants to keep producing more energy, we are giving him opportunities, but he says no. He said "no" many times, and he campaigned on that. We will continue to push to bring those bills to the floor.

We are going to continue to push to bring bills to the floor to solve a lot of these problems that we have identified, and we have bills to address them. If the majority doesn't want to bring them up, I understand. That is the prerogative of the majority, but we are going to still keep talking about them.

We are going to still keep pushing every opportunity we can to bring down inflation, to lower energy costs, and to address so many of these other problems that people are still facing today.

If that single mom who is working as a waitress two shifts is going to be audited by some new IRS agent who is tasked, under the terms that we saw, with going out and generating that

money, if the result of that is that she has to pay more money, it doesn't mean she is cheating on her taxes. If all of a sudden an auditor is coming after you, who knows what kind of pressure they are putting?

But it is 87,000 more IRS agents tasked with going and generating not \$20 billion. The \$20 billion is just for the people making under \$400,000. It is over \$250 billion that some of the numbers show that they have to generate, meaning they are going to have to go out and find that from taxpayers.

That doesn't mean every one of those people they audit is a tax cheat. It just means that person is going to now face an audit who otherwise is working two or three shifts to meet the demands of these higher costs that they are facing because of inflation.

We are going to continue fighting for those hardworking families and fighting to lower the burden on this government, take some of that heat off so they can spend more time at home with their family, not working two or three shifts or worrying about the next audit they are going to face from a new IRS agent who is told to go generate more money. Hopefully, we can address that. We will continue to push for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think we are probably pretty close to closing.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker. I think the American people are in the process of making a judgment. On our side, we see things as pretty positive in terms of the response to the policies that we have been adopting without any significant help from our Republican colleagues, but they will have a chance to vote and decide.

We have passed legislation, as we said we would do, for the people—not for the sake of politics but for the sake of children, families, the young and old, and, yes, even the rich and poor.

I want to comment because I urge my Republican friends to be precise in their conversations with the American public. There are not 80,000 revenue auditors or agents included in this bill that we talked about on bringing inflation down and which economists say will bring inflation down.

Our Republican friends say they want to do that, but they vote against bills that will bring down demonstrably, and without possibility of denial, costs for people, health costs for people, prescription drug costs for people, insulin, which costs about—it is single figures, and we capped it at \$35. That is about 400 percent profit, but they are now paying \$300 or \$400 or \$500.

Now, luckily, because we could pass it with Democrats, seniors won't be paying that. They will be capped at \$35. But millions of other Americans, because the Republicans would not support it in the United States Senate—we passed it here—will not get the benefit of that cap. They will be paying far above justifiable prices for insulin.

We are producing energy. The argument is specious that somehow this inflation is caused by our cutting back on energy supply when I just read a figure, subject to dispute. Maybe next week I will hear, no, that figure is wrong. Maybe. We are producing more energy than Trump did—not Trump himself, but the country—during Trump's Presidency.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends to tell the American people the truth. Yes, there are some more agents because there are people not paying their fair share. If you have an audit, and they say you are not paying your fair share, and you pay more, isn't that what we expect when we pass tax bills, that people will pay pursuant to what the law says, whether they make \$100,000 or \$100 million or \$100 billion? I don't guess anybody makes \$100 billion in a year.

We ought to be honest with the American people. Give them the facts, and then they will make a decision, but tell them the truth.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to be honest with the American people. It was the administration that used the 87,000 number. If that number should be lower, I would love to hear what that number would be.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland. If the gentleman has a number, please tell me because that is what we heard from the administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there are 80,000-plus additional, which will get back to the 20 years ago level of employment in the IRS. The IRS has been reduced in personnel in all categories, not just enforcement agents, but in all categories, which will undermine their ability to serve the public and collect taxes so that we all pay our fair share and so people who don't have accountants and who don't have ways and means to avoid taxes are treated fairly themselves.

Everybody ought to be treated fairly. If we don't think they are being treated fairly because of the law then we ought to change the law, but we ought to tell the American people the truth.

There are not that many enforcement agents. They are in so many different categories in the IRS to make sure that the IRS can successfully do its job and answer people's questions about what, when, where, and why they have to do things pursuant to law. That is what I meant, not that the 80,000 people are enforcement agents. They are not. They are not. It is a far lower number than that.

But we know that there is over \$100 billion—I think it is a much larger figure than that—in taxes that are owed under the law that are not being paid, which means that the tax rates need to be higher on others than they ought to be.

That is what this bill gets at. In other words, this bill, the inflation re-

duction bill, is more than reducing inflation. I am sorry that my Republican friends made a determination it was not a bill they could support to help bring down inflation, but that was the judgment they made.

I think they want to bring down inflation. We want to bring down inflation, but when we present a bill to the floor which does it, we would hope we would get support on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. SCALISE. We will continue to tell the truth about these policies. Clearly, there is a disagreement on many of them, but that is why we have this debate. I look forward to continuing it with the gentleman.

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

HONORING RETIRED NEW JERSEY STATE SENATOR RONALD L. RICE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor New Jersey State Senator Ronald L. Rice after his retirement on August 31 of this year.

Senator Rice served the people of New Jersey's 28th District for 36 years. He was the longest serving Black legislator in our State's history.

Senator Rice was first elected to the Newark City Council in 1981. Then, he was elected to the State Senate in 1986 and won reelection 11 times before he retired.

His service extended beyond politics. Senator Rice was a sergeant in the Marine Corps and a decorated Vietnam veteran. He spent 8 years as a police detective in the city of Newark and 4 years as its deputy mayor.

He was known for his strong support and advocacy for social justice and civil rights. Recently, Newark renamed a street in his neighborhood in his honor for his commitment and service to the city of Newark.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate State Senator Ronald L. Rice on his tremendous career as a public servant. His work for Newark and the people of New Jersey will be missed. But I am sure this will not be the last we hear from our hero and our fighter, Senator Ronald L. Rice.

□ 1645

RECOGNIZING ALAN DEWART

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

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate the 80th birthday of Alan Dewart, a business and civic leader in our community.

Alan has been an entrepreneur and real estate developer for his entire professional life. Alan's impact on the re-

vitalization of the city of Buffalo is unparalleled.

During the dark economic times of the 1980s when the city was experiencing a mass exodus of people, businesses, and hope, Alan was a pioneer who reinvested and revitalized a section of downtown Buffalo, taking vacant and derelict buildings in Buffalo's theater district and transforming it into a vibrant city center consisting of apartments, restaurants, and music/entertainment venues, infusing life and vibrancy back into a historically significant section of our city.

Alan's pioneering work sowed the seeds of future developers and future projects to bring downtown Buffalo back to life.

I interned for Alan Dewart as a college student and through him developed a passion for urban revitalization. He is a friend and a mentor, and I thank him for all he has done for me and all he has done for our city.

WE MUST ENSHRINE THE FREEDOMS ROE V. WADE PROTECTED

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, Republicans swore up and down that all they wanted was for the States to decide.

But this week, in this Congress, they introduced a national criminal ban on abortion, saying this is what we stand for, this is what we will do if our party takes the House and Senate.

Their bill is designed for one purpose and will have one effect: to shred protections women still enjoy in States like New Jersey, where we codified Roe v. Wade this year.

Let me tell you where the overwhelming majority of folks in New Jersey stand. We know abortion is a painful and personal issue for many families. That is precisely why we want and trust women to decide, not the government. The issue is complicated. Who decides is not.

That is why I will do everything in my power to prevent Congress from imposing on New Jersey laws that treat women and doctors as criminals and why we must enshrine the freedoms Roe v. Wade protected in the law of our land once and for all.

REMEMBERING DIDAR SINGH BAINS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to acknowledge the loss of a pillar of our community in northern California, Didar Singh Bains of Yuba City.

He lived a full life to the age of 84 and passed away peacefully at his home, surrounded by his family, on Tuesday, September 13.