

companies have to comply with scientifically informed policy.

The Biden administration is appropriately trying to help develop U.S. climate reporting rules that are also scientifically informed to minimize the hassle of multijurisdictional reporting.

The Republican response to that is big mad. Today, we are voting on a bill that would defund the ability of regulators to develop consistent climate accounting rules instead of doing the work of the people.

Mr. Speaker, science is real. We have real challenges. Please stop being big mad.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY CHIEF MIKE MERNICK OF THE WARRICK FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic actions of Deputy Chief Mike Mernick of the Warwick Fire Department.

Mike and his wife, Tara, were enjoying a night out in Providence, not long ago, when they noticed a fire had broken out at a nearby home on Goddard Street.

When he saw the smoke coming out of the triple-decker and realized there were people trapped inside the building, the off-duty, 28-year-old firefighter sprang into action.

He ran into the burning building with two Providence police officers at his side, covered in no protective gear or equipment. He just knew there was no time to waste.

They headed up two flights of smoke-filled stairs where they found a mother with her two children and rushed them out to safety. Mernick remained in the building, clearing each floor, as the fire raged around him.

Thanks to the quick actions of Deputy Chief Mernick and the two officers, all eight people in the building were rescued safely.

Deputy Chief Mernick's actions are a reminder that firefighters are heroes in every sense of the word.

PROPOSED CUTS ON AMTRAK

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this week, President Biden announced more than \$16 billion in Federal funding for the Northeast Corridor, the busiest in the United States, through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.

While that is a very admirable and needed effort, I would like to call attention to the LOSSAN Corridor, the second busiest rail corridor, which runs right through my district. It is the only rail link between San Diego and Los Angeles.

The integrity of the LOSSAN Corridor is arguably at greater risk than

any other corridor in the country. It runs along the Pacific Ocean and has repeatedly closed due to climate change-induced sea level rise, collapsing bluffs, and eroding beaches. That has cost our economy millions of dollars per year and impacts my constituents' ability to get where they need to go.

The LOSSAN Corridor is the busiest State-supported route for Amtrak, which is currently facing 64 percent funding cuts in the Republican T-HUD appropriations bill.

This is the wrong approach. We must invest in Amtrak and associated infrastructure. I will continue to advocate for the Biden administration to invest in the LOSSAN Corridor so California can get its fair share of resources.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my partners in California, and especially Governor Newsom, for continuing to fight for this historic investment.

HONORING THE VETERANS OF OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the veterans of our country. There are over 16,000 veterans in my district.

Mr. Speaker, 16,000 people have given their heart and soul to our Nation. For so many, that call to serve has affected their health.

In my district alone, the VA has received 1,164 claims under the PACT Act as of this October. That was possible because of the incredible work of House Democrats to pass this law last Congress.

Currently, many VA centers lack the ability to provide care for gynecological cancers. That leaves female veterans to search for their own care. That must change. We need to fight for our female veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to reintroducing the Veterans' Cancer Care Coordinator Act this week. This bill would create coordinators to help female veterans receive the care they need from diagnosis through remission. This builds on the successful Maternal Care Coordination program at the VA.

As a Nation, we must protect our Nation's heroes. We must also put veterans above politics. We must thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the veterans for their service.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING PAULA SANDS

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

Mr. SORENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a local leader in broadcast news and fellow Quad citizen.

For more than 40 years, families in our region could count on the friendly

demeanor and seasoned professionalism of Paula Sands on KWQC TV 6 News.

Paula boasts an accomplished career, taking the helm as the region's youngest woman to host her own TV show at the age of 23. Since then, and for the past three decades, she hosted "Paula Sands Live", a news show dedicated to current events and local businesses.

She is an Emmy award winner. She has taken a seat in the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences' Silver Circle.

All the while, Paula served her hometown as a trusted voice.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to enter the contributions of such a legendary figure into the RECORD. I wish Paula Sands my sincerest gratitude and well-wishes as she enters retirement.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4664, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 847 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4664.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York (Mr. WILLIAMS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0912

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mr. WILLIAMS of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to begin consideration of H.R. 4664, the fiscal

year 2024 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill.

Before I get into details, I would like to recognize the hard work of Chairwoman GRANGER on this bill, and the entire appropriations process.

We are one step closer to passing the last remaining few appropriations bills. I also want to thank my good friend, Ranking Member STENY HOYER, for his input on this bill. We have had many conversations. STENY is a dear friend of mine, somebody that I worked very closely with, not only with this bill, but other matters of importance to our country. I consider him a very, very dear friend, and it is an honor to have him at my side as the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, look at these people right here. This is my team. I know I am a bit prejudiced. STENY would probably say the same thing about his team. These are the best that we have. We have Lauren Flynn and her team and my personal staff. The work they have put into this process is truly remarkable.

I want the American people to know how dedicated these folks are in trying to deal with the challenges that face our country on an everyday basis, in this case, the funding of our government.

□ 0915

I could not do what I do, nor could any Member of this House of Representatives, no Member can do what they do without the dedication of these people. It is not lost on me, and I want to publicly recognize them.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4664 provides \$25.279 billion in nondefense discretionary spending across a number of critical agencies. The swath that we cover is incredible.

It also includes \$45 million in defense spending. It rejects over \$6 billion in discretionary funding increases within the President's budget request.

The bill represents an adequate level of funding, given our fiscal constraints. It is 7 percent below the fiscal year '23 enacted level and 2 percent below the fiscal year '22 enacted level.

The bill provides the resources necessary to combat threats and protect the integrity of our financial and judicial system.

We claw back over \$10 billion of unused and unobligated Inflation Reduction Act IRS funding preventing the creation of a super army of IRS agents poised to target individuals and small business owners. This rescission does not touch taxpayer services or the modernization of business systems which means taxpayers will still be able to get the assistance they need to file their taxes, and the IRS can continue to modernize their systems and better protect taxpayer data from cyberattacks.

We also rescind IRA money from the General Services Administration targeted to make Federal buildings greener. Instead of leading by example in the construction of sustainable

buildings, GSA should lead by example by bringing their employees back to the office like the private sector.

I am proud this bill requires Federal agencies to return to the office at prepandemic telework levels. We must hold the Federal workforce accountable for the quality of their work and the service they provide to the American people. The administration has been unwilling to make any real progress on this front, and we cannot afford to have vacant Federal buildings in the District and across our country.

The bill demands that agencies concentrate on their core mission. Mr. Chair, let me say that again. It is important that our agencies that we fund stick to their core mission. The pursuit of job-killing, burdensome, and unnecessary regulations only serve to further bloat a Federal bureaucracy that has become, in my strong opinion, too big, too intrusive, and counterintuitive to limited government.

Specifically, we turn off rulemaking in the Securities and Exchange Commission that lack proper cost-benefit analysis and aggregate income analysis. Further, we prohibit agencies like the SEC and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from collecting and storing personal data that is unconstitutional and serves no regulatory purpose.

To be clear, the agencies under our jurisdiction perform important functions; however, many have strayed from their purpose, and the results have been a true disservice to the American people. This bill responsibly returns them to their core mission.

Mr. Chair, this bill is a strong bill with funding reductions and policy wins, I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I echo the remarks of the chairman of this committee. The American public, I think, would be pleased and say: Look, this is how it ought to work.

Mr. WOMACK and I have great respect for one another. We are great friends and have been long before we were chair and ranking member on this subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee. He is a person of great integrity, great insight, and a great work ethic. He is somebody who the House can be proud of. He is somebody whom I hold, as he said of me, as a dear friend.

I also want to echo his comments about the staff. The public doesn't see the staff for the most part as, frankly, they don't see the overwhelming majority of Federal employees who are not known to the general public. There is a tendency to talk about bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is used as a pejorative term and not as a descriptive term, and that is unfortunate because the overwhelming—overwhelming—majority of Federal employees carry out their duties with great fidelity to their responsibilities and to the American

people. So this bill is not the bill that, for the most part, most people focus on.

Nevertheless, it is one of the most important bills that we consider because all 11 other appropriation bills are reliant on the collections made through this bill, and that is why I think it is so critical.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House ought to make it their goal to preserve America's fiscal health.

Sharing that common goal, President Biden, Speaker McCARTHY and 149 Republicans, and 165 Democrats—314 people, which is 75 percent essentially of this House—agreed on a plan of going forward.

The first thing you do on a plan, Mr. Chair, is to decide how much are we going to spend?

The President had a higher level, and some in this House and the Senate had a lower level. Speaker McCARTHY and President Biden came together, and they agreed on a spending level. That is what we call, if we had done it through the regular order, a 302(a) allocation. In other words, it is what we are going to spend on the discretionary side of the ledger, which, by the way, is smaller than the mandatory side.

We did that. We adopted that bill, as I said, with over 300 votes. Unfortunately, a week later that agreement was broken by the Republican side of the aisle in saying: No, we are not going to do that. We are not going to follow that agreement. We are going to fund at a much lesser level.

Now, the problem with that is Republican and Democratic Members of the Senate pursued under that agreement, and so they are literally billions of dollars different than we will be when these 12 bills, assuming we pass these 12 bills, are sent over to the Senate.

There are some in this House who have a theory that, well, that gives us the opportunity to negotiate for more numbers. The problem with negotiating for more numbers is that nobody believes they are real.

That is not true. Some do. Some do. Some few in this body believe this is real and that they are going to somehow leverage these numbers and force the Senate and the President to do what they want them to do. The President of the United States and his administration have issued a veto threat on this bill if it were to be adopted. They are not going to have to exercise that veto because this bill is not going to be adopted.

Nevertheless, I will tell you, Mr. Chair, if Mr. WOMACK and I were left to our own devices—and he has a different perspective than I do, and that is what makes this body work—then we would come to an agreement that we think would pass the Senate and be signed by the President.

Why?

It is because we would do what in a democracy you have to do, Mr. Chair. We would come together and compromise, realizing full well that we

have a Democratic President, a Democratic-controlled Senate, and a Republican almost majority. It is an absolute majority. I understand that politically. Nonetheless, it is not a majority that can always hold together, and; therefore, it can't always effect the policies that it knows are reasonable and can be adopted.

Now, I said at the beginning that we ought to preserve America's fiscal health, and I believe that sincerely. The deal that we made, 67 percent of House Republicans voted for it. That bill that we have before us does not honor that agreement. As I said, it does not establish a foundation, really, for negotiation. It does nothing to avert the shutdown looming just a few days from today.

Crucially, it will increase the deficit over time, and I will explain why. In fact, this legislation severely undermines the government's ability to lower the deficit and to uphold the law of the land. It defunds crucial agencies that enforce laws, regulations, and rules established to protect the American people, American families, and America's children.

Those cuts include the FTC, the SEC, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Election Assistance Commission, and the FCC. This is essentially saying to Americans: You are on your own. We are going to reduce oversight.

This bill defends justice, if you will. It dramatically cuts funding for the Federal public defender program which helps ensure every American can exercise their constitutional right to an attorney.

Other law enforcement agencies face dire cuts under this legislation. Among them, Mr. Chair, is the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. We hear a lot about fentanyl, we hear a lot about money laundering, and we hear a lot about the drug cartels making a lot of money.

Mr. Chair, we created the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, otherwise known as FinCEN, for the specific purpose of following the money. That is how Willie Sutton, obviously, got caught: tax evasion. Follow the money. We have undermined that premise in this bill.

We then decrease the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence.

Terrorism is one of the great challenges of our time, and what do we do?

We decrease the agencies that are charged with overseeing that, among other agencies.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy, now you would think, Mr. Chair, given the expression that all of us have and concern we have about fentanyl, drug abuse, and drug deaths in this country, that we would beef up that office to make sure that we can, in fact, confront this scourge on our people and our country. No. We cut it.

The emergency planning and security costs in this city, the Capital City, to

which millions of our constituents come, are reduced.

In total, this bill cuts \$345 million, or 6.2 percent, below the enacted for crucial law enforcement agencies. It provides \$1.32 billion, or 20.2 percent, less for law enforcement than what President Biden requested in his Office.

Mr. Chair, in that context, I would ask: Who is defunding the police?

Yet, Republicans have the nerve, frankly—not my chairman—some Republicans have the nerve to accuse Democrats of trying to defund law enforcement.

Paring back enforcement has dire consequences for the deficit, as well, Mr. Chair. This legislation is the latest salvo in some Republicans' long campaign to defund the Internal Revenue Service. The number of annual tax returns, Mr. Chair, increased from 140.1 million in 1979 to 269 million in 2021. That is a 92 percent increase in workload.

So what is our response?

It is over the years to reduce from 85,000 people in 1979 trying to handle this extraordinary workload to in 2021 78,661. This is an 8 percent decrease while a 92 percent workload increase occurred. That means refunds get delayed, returns aren't audited, owed taxes go uncollected, tax cheats and lawbreakers are not held accountable, and our debt grows even bigger.

Mr. Chair, if you are a business trying to get the revenue you are owed, frankly, you don't fire the collection department. If you had bad debts, you would go after them. This bill does just that. It cuts the collection department.

Contrary to Republican claims, this issue isn't about raising taxes on anyone. My friend, the majority leader, opined on this floor that these agents were going to raise people's taxes. Those agents can't raise anybody's taxes. The only people who can raise or lower taxes are the people who sit in this body and across the Hall and the President of the United States. No agent can do that.

□ 0930

All the agents can do is collect what is owed under the laws that we passed. Those agents instead ensure that we each pay the share we legally owe, and they go after the cheats and lawbreakers who don't.

If you are for law and order, that is what you are for. If people cheat, if people break the law, you hold them accountable. If you are going to hold them accountable, you need the personnel to do so because some of them have scads of lawyers and accountants and very complicated returns of thousands of pages.

Too often, those lawbreakers are Americans with a lot of wealth and complex tax files. I am not talking about the overwhelming majority of Americans whose taxes are withheld on a weekly, biweekly, or monthly basis. I am talking about the select few who use passthroughs, shell companies, and

offshore accounts to shield their vast wealth from taxation. I don't want them to pay any more than is owed, and I don't have any beef against anybody who is wealthy. What I have beef against is people who cheat and cheat their country.

Harvard and Treasury experts found that there is a 12-to-1 return on investment for IRS enforcement of the top 10 percent of earners. If you spend \$1, you get \$12 back. That is a pretty good deal, and it makes a real difference.

Years of budget and staffing cuts have limited the IRS' ability to conduct these complex audits because they are extraordinarily time consuming and complex.

Millionaires were 88 percent less likely to face an audit in fiscal year 2022 than they were in fiscal year 2010. That is an almost 100 percent reduction, from essentially \$9-plus to \$1. The result is a backdoor tax cut, but only for those with the means and guile to exploit accounting tricks to hide profits, income, and, in the end, tax obligation. They have a duty to support their country, the national security, and the healthcare investments we make in Medicare and Social Security.

This bill includes a 22.2 percent cut below the request for IRS enforcement. My chairman will correctly observe that the other items he will point out have been held relatively harmless. It is only the collection department that was cut.

By the way, a recent article from just last month pointed out that the IRS now estimates that there is \$688 billion in unpaid taxes. Let's think of what that would do to the deficit over time if you collected the money that was due, not that you are increasing, but that was due. That is a disservice to hardworking Americans who patriotically and conscientiously pay their taxes.

This bill defunds those agencies of government that keep us safe, with a cut below the enacted of \$9.6 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, which I talked about; \$24.2 million for FinCEN, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; and \$9.2 million for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence that confronts terrorism everywhere you find it.

It disrupts the agencies that ensure the products we buy and the markets we invest in aren't overrun with fraud by undermining the independence of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

By cutting the Consumer Products Safety Commission, it makes it very hard for consumers, Mr. Chair, to make the determination of: Is this product safe? Has it been tested? They rely on us to make sure that, yes, it has been tested and that, yes, it is safe so it won't hurt or kill their children.

They are cutting the SEC by \$149 million, which disrupts the markets if people don't trust them. You didn't have an overseer in 1920. Now, you have an overseer, and people have much more trust because of that overseer.

It hampers the agencies that make those who try to get one over on the rest of us think twice and that hold these people accountable with a cut of \$7 million to the FEC, \$53 million to the Federal Trade Commission, and \$8 million to the Federal Communications Commission, which, by the way, in part is responsible for making sure we don't get all those junk calls all the time that annoy the living daylights out of all of us.

These are just some of the cuts. If Republicans want to be the party of fiscal responsibility, if they want to be the party of law enforcement, they need to shelve this bill.

They know this legislation will never become law. They have loaded it with partisan poison pills, which I have not spoken of but that I am sure will be spoken of during the course of this, such as undermining a woman's right to choose.

I am sure that everybody saw what happened in Ohio yesterday. Ohio, for the most part, has been a red State, but it overwhelmingly said a woman's right to choose needs to be protected. They believed in that so much that they are going to put it in the Ohio Constitution.

This bill has been loaded with partisan poison pills designed to varnish American history. We don't want to talk about slavery. We don't want to make anybody feel bad about what their country did to people because of the color of their skin or their sexual orientation. This bill undermines diversity, equity, and inclusion and exacerbates the climate crisis.

Mr. Chair, we will talk about a lot of this bill for the next few hours. I hope it is a few hours, not more than that. I think the chair and I will try to achieve that objective.

We ought to stop this nonsense. We are going to have a lot of amendments to reduce salaries to \$1. That is not a serious Congress. It is not a serious Rules Committee to have 55 amendments reducing salaries to \$1.

The only ones that have been approved have been approved by a voice vote. Every other one has been defeated, yet we keep dealing with these silly amendments while we undermine America's ability to collect the revenues it needs to protect the American people, play our role throughout the international community, and make America a safer and greater country.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, Steny and I are really good friends, and this goes all the way back to when I first got here. He had already been here for a long time. I won't say how much time, but quite a while, so I learn from people like that.

That being said, we have a different view in many cases, sometimes about the role of the government or why we need to fund the government at levels

that they would prefer. I am going to pick one issue. There are many we could talk about, but he mentioned fentanyl.

Nobody in this country would argue that we don't have a fentanyl problem. Mr. Chairman, 100,000 people a year are dying as a result of this synthetic, illegal substance that is making its way across our borders.

Mr. Chairman, what this side of the aisle believes is that instead of fighting the issue on the inside of the country—and let me remind you that on the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, we fund HIDTA at a level higher than the President of the United States requested. It is a little bit less than last year but higher than the President's request.

I reject out of hand the notion that we are endangering the lives of Americans because all of a sudden we don't think that fentanyl is a problem. No, we believe fentanyl is a problem, but we believe the problem should be addressed at the border of this country, at our southern border, where a lot of this product is making its way across without any real effort to stop it.

It is making its way into the households of America, from sea to shining sea. Then all of a sudden we get accused of wanting to cut budgets for agencies that target that illegal substance. For some reason, we are the bad guys.

We think that if we had better border security, which is something that both sides of the aisle have argued about for decades, maybe we wouldn't need as much money to fight these problems interior to our country.

I use that as an example, and there are others, but let's just agree on this: With the better part of a \$2 trillion deficit this year, we have to address the root cause of what is causing such a difficult spot for this Nation, and that is the fiscal health of the country.

Mr. Chairman, \$2 trillion deficits, as far as the eye can see, are not a sustainable outcome. We are over \$33 trillion in debt right now, and I guess the debt service of our country—I don't know what the current numbers are, but it is approaching a trillion dollars a year.

We should think for just a moment what we could do if, instead of paying our creditors, we are able to use that trillion dollars for programs that benefit all Americans. That is a subject for a different day.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON), my dear friend who is a very valued member of this subcommittee and a bright, shining star in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding me the time to speak on this very important piece of legislation today and for his leadership on this bill. It is tough to craft a bill that funds the priorities of the American people in a way that is targeted and respects tax-

payers, and I appreciate the gentleman's approach to do that in a very meaningful way.

Mr. Chair, it is why I am supporting this bill here today, the fiscal year 2024 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill.

This bill delivers on the promises that we have made to the American people. We are reining in out-of-control spending and regulation. We are restoring accountability for taxpayers. We are dewatering the Federal Government.

Additionally, as the chairman mentioned, we are prioritizing national security against our foreign adversaries, both in dealing with the border and also in dealing with adversaries like China.

This bill promotes a Federal Government that works for the American people. We are ensuring that bureaucrats who have been abusing the COVID-19 telework policies and are still working from home actually go back to work and get back in the office like America is. They need to start putting in 100 percent effort for the taxpayers that pay their salary.

I am not sure how many of my colleagues here in the Chamber, Mr. Chair, are aware of the GAO report that came out over the summer, but it flagged that 17 of 24 Federal agencies here in Washington, D.C., were only using, on average, about 25 percent of their office space.

Taxpayers fund the bill for these offices. It is \$7 billion a year. The lights were on, but no one was home. We need to make sure that they are putting 100 percent effort in for the taxpayers that pay their salary.

I am sure all of our offices are getting the same calls mine are about reductions in government services, and we need to make sure they are giving 100 percent.

This bill also restores accountability by reining in rogue overreaching agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that will now be subject to congressional oversight and will answer to the American taxpayer rather than being able to pursue a partisan agenda that hurts our small businesses.

This bill also protects American families and small businesses by rescinding funding for President Biden's proposals to supercharge an army of IRS agents, while maintaining those very important taxpayer service operations. We don't want to see a reduction in services for our taxpayers, and when they are calling, they should not be getting a dial tone.

Our bill also protects Iowa farmers from onerous regulations like the SEC's climate disclosure rule and the expansive Scope 3 emissions disclosure requirement. This would be disastrous for producers not only in my district but around the country. It would bury our hardworking farmers, who feed and fuel the world, in paperwork and compliance costs.

□ 0945

We are also taking strong steps to ensure that we are bolstering national security against threats from our adversaries, like the Chinese Communist Party. I also serve on the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party. I think this is of utmost importance, Mr. Chair. We need to protect taxpayer resources from supporting the Wuhan Institute of Virology or any other laboratory operated by the CCP.

Finally, this includes my language to require the GSA to investigate the status of Chinese surveillance equipment on Federal property. It supports efforts to remove that telecom equipment from U.S. networks.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Chair, I think this really hits the mark in investing in the priorities I continue to hear about from my constituents. It is why I am proud to support it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURU), the distinguished former chair and current ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURU. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman WOMACK, Ranking Member HOYER, and the subcommittee staff, especially Matt Smith and Philip Tizzani, for all the work they do.

This Financial Services and General Government bill put forth by the majority is unacceptable. The Republicans propose cutting critical agencies the American people depend on for a stable, secure, safe, and fair economy by a staggering 58 percent.

My colleagues across the aisle often claim to support things like law and order, economic competition, and protecting children. Yet, their actions demonstrated by this bill suggest otherwise.

Cuts to the Small Business Administration would cut off assistance and resources that help small businesses start, grow, and compete.

Cuts to the Securities and Exchange Commission would benefit market manipulators and inside traders over families saving for retirement.

Cuts to the Federal Trade Commission would levy higher prices on Americans and make seniors more prone to be victimized by scammers.

Cuts to the Consumer Product Safety Commission would enable dangerous products to hit store shelves and enter our homes, potentially harming our children.

Finally, cuts to the Internal Revenue Service would protect cheats over honest, hardworking families. We know an underfunded, understaffed, and overwhelmed IRS means the wealthiest billionaires and corporations avoid paying taxes. According to Secretary Yellen,

“In 2019, the top 1 percent of Americans was estimated to owe over one-fifth of unpaid taxes, leaving ordinary Americans to shoulder the burden.”

Furthermore, in 2021, the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy found that at least 55 of the largest corporations in America—in a year they saw over \$40 billion in pretax income—had paid no Federal corporate income taxes. Corporations like Nike, Hewlett-Packard, and Dish Network paid zero Federal income taxes.

Treasury recently announced that thanks to the resources provided in the Inflation Reduction Act, the IRS is pursuing back taxes owed from about 1,600 taxpayers with incomes over \$1 million. They have so far closed 100 of those cases, collecting \$122 million since September. That is not a tax increase. That is collecting revenue legally owed.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle frame the debt as a problem of our investments in the American people. We have a revenue problem, and they refuse to let the IRS collect legally owed taxes from their billionaire and corporate friends to address this problem.

We cannot stand for the disadvantaging of small businesses, making seniors susceptible to scammers, exposing children to dangerous products, and rigging the stock market for the well-connected and wealthiest.

Earlier this year, I met with SBA Administrator Guzman. The Administration is extraordinarily concerned with how they would provide the resources America's entrepreneurs rely on to help start their businesses and grow if these cuts are enacted. Small businesses are an essential part of the American economy and really are the core to the financial security of our middle class. They define Main Street in neighborhoods across the country.

This bill not only slashes funding for the IRS by \$1.1 billion, but it takes back more than \$10 billion in funding provided in the Inflation Reduction Act. This is on top of cuts to the IRS that the majority is pursuing as a condition for providing aid to Israel, and in addition to the \$57 billion in cuts to the IRS' Inflation Reduction Act funding in the other 11 appropriations bills.

These cuts would rob the Treasury of \$130 billion and hand it directly to billionaires, the biggest corporations, fraudsters, and tax cheats. That is not according to me. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about wanting to be tough on China, and yet this bill includes no funding for the Administration's efforts to restrict outbound investment in countries like China that threaten our national security. The majority is giving a green light to the potential offshoring of critical United States' supply chains to foreign adversaries like China and Russia.

Of course, the majority doesn't stop there. They have included dozens of

problematic, pointless riders, including prohibitions on the SEC's climate disclosure rule, prohibitions on healthcare and abortion, micromanaging the District of Columbia's traffic laws at a level that is petty and deserves derision.

The Financial Services and General Government bill is central to effectively running the Federal Government and providing services to the American people. The majority's bill instead focuses on protecting the tax dollars and priorities of billionaires and big corporations.

For all these reasons, I cannot support this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I recognize my dear friends, Chairman WOMACK and Ranking Member HOYER, and I do mean that in the truest sense of the word, for their work on this bill, which does contain several of my priorities.

I do want to respond quickly to the chairman's comments about the border really being the problem with fentanyl coming across into the United States and that it is not necessary to fund the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

When you focus on safety, making sure that you can keep people safe from harm that they can't avoid on their own, we need layers of protection. So it is a fool's errand to cut an office like the Office of National Drug Control Policy because we aren't doing enough, in your mind, to handle drug entries into the country from the border. It is “both/and” when it comes to safety, not “either/or.”

Unfortunately, this bill, although it does contain several of my priorities, has so many misguided, toxic, and extreme provisions that it will make us all less safe and careens our government once again toward a shutdown.

This is a bill that is rather unsung. I always try to come and talk about this bill. It does have a whole lot of acronym agencies that have far reach into Americans' protection, security, and safety. It is so important that we make sure we shine a little bit of a spotlight on it as a result.

This bill does prioritize reducing pool and spa deaths by providing \$2.5 million for programs authorized under my Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act, for which I appreciate the chairman's help. As the leading cause of unintentional death for children under 5 in the United States, drowning is clearly a public health threat that we must confront.

However, sadly, overall this bill makes all of our constituents less safe. This bill handcuffs consumer watchdogs, leaving hardworking families more vulnerable to fraud or dangerous deadly products. It guts the Consumer Product Safety Commission's already paltry budget, slashing resources at an agency that has a major focus on protecting children and families. We need

to keep families safe, not make them nervous to choose products when they walk down the aisles of a store.

On top of protecting scammers and cheats, this bill hurts public servants and threatens our national security.

How does it do that? The same Republicans who claim to support our national defense and Armed Forces would cut the National Security Council in this bill and the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence.

The same Republicans who boast how tough they are on heroin and fentanyl actually cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy in this bill.

Don't believe Republicans who claim to be the party of law and order, either. This bill actually underfunds multiple levels of our Federal courts and the public defenders. This bill basically waves white-collar criminals right on through to do their sketchy business by cutting the SEC and the FTC.

If you want to empower scammers and cheats or get more robocallers bothering you at home by ringing your phone off the hook, vote for this bill, but if you want to protect families, vote against it.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. WOMACK, chairman of the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee, not only for his leadership but his rabid support of the Razorbacks. Kentucky and Arkansas have a big rivalry in basketball, but in this case we are on the same page because the chairman has rightly included in this year's FSGG appropriations bill my legislation, H.R. 1382, the Taking Account of Bureaucrats' Spending Act, or the TABS Act, which would separate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from the Federal Reserve System, make it an independent agency and subject it, importantly, to the congressional appropriations process.

The TABS Act would remedy the serious constitutional defect in the structure of the CFPB as established by the Dodd-Frank Act under which the CFPB draws its funding uniquely from the Federal Reserve instead of from Congress, like most other executive branch agencies. Specifically, Dodd-Frank delegates to the Director of the CFPB the unilateral power to decide in perpetuity how much money he wants for the agency to carry out its broad and potent regulatory and enforcement powers.

The Director then requests such amount from the Fed, which is itself exempt from the congressional appropriations process, making it double insulated from accountability. The Fed is then required to provide such amount to the Bureau, no questions asked. This is a constitutional aberration, and it is a violation of the separation of powers.

Although the total amount the Director can request is capped in the law,

the cap is so high that it effectively grants the CFPB Director unfettered discretion over the Bureau's amount of funding and how it is spent. No other Federal agency in the entire Federal bureaucracy is funded in this manner. Indeed, there is no analogue for the CFPB anywhere in the history of the U.S. executive branch.

Even among self-funded agencies, the Bureau is unique. It is a perpetual self-directed, double-insulated funding structure that goes a significant step further than that enjoyed by any other agency, again, in the history of our Republic.

The TABS Act would fix this. It would bring much-needed accountability to the CFPB and uphold the Constitution's separation of powers and the exclusive grants of the appropriations power to Congress.

I want to make a couple of points about the TABS Act. First, the purpose of this bill is not to repeal or undermine consumer protection laws. Rather, the purpose is to address the constitutional defect in the CFPB's funding structure. No one is objecting to the utility of some Federal consumer protections, but we should also agree that the Constitution reserves to Congress the sole authority to set funding limits for the CFPB and other executive branch agencies.

I note that the FY24 FSGG bill would fund the CFPB at near current levels. I also note that H.R. 2798, the CFPB Transparency and Accountability Reform Act, which was marked up out of the Financial Services Committee on April 26, included the TABS Act, and authorized to be appropriated from unobligated amounts contained in the Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund \$650 million for FY24—again, at levels comparable to what the CFPB received from the Fed this year.

My friends on the other side of the aisle can't make the argument that we are trying to defund the agency, that we are trying to gut consumer protection laws because we are manifestly proving we are not doing that. We are funding the agency the way it should be. This clearly demonstrates that the TABS Act is not about eliminating consumer protections or the CFPB, but it is about upholding the Constitution. It is about defending the Congress, this institution.

If this bill is enacted into law, the Bureau would continue to operate. The only difference would be that the Congress would oversee their spending in the same way it does for all other consumer protection agencies in most of the rest of the Federal Government.

□ 1000

As you know, the Supreme Court recently heard the case of *Community Financial Services Association of America v. CFPB* in which the agency's funding structure was challenged as violating the Constitution's separation of powers and the appropriations clause, which provides that: 'No

money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law"

If the Supreme Court strikes down the CFPB's funding structure, as it should in this case, this bill will ensure that the agency continues to operate.

Following such a decision by the Court, chaos would not ensue, as some have suggested, nor would there be great uncertainty in the marketplace about the status of consumer protection laws and regulations.

On the contrary, this legislation demonstrates that Congress is prepared to assert its appropriations power to stabilize preexisting consumer laws and make sure that the CFPB is funded with better and more meaningful oversight in the event that the Supreme Court strikes down the funding mechanism.

The Founding Fathers wanted to make sure that the legislative branch—the people's elected Representatives in Congress—make the key decisions about our government, especially how tax dollars are spent.

As Madison wrote in Federalist Paper No. 58: "This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure."

This is a sound principle, which in the context of the CFPB or any other executive branch agency, every member of Congress, Republican and Democrat, should defend.

This is not a partisan issue. This is about defending this institution and our power of the purse. I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: If Congress passed legislation funding the Department of Defense or the CIA in the same manner as the CFPB is currently funded, would that be acceptable? Would we want those agencies to be completely unaccountable to our oversight?

The appropriations process is the primary means by which Congress, on a bipartisan basis, oversees those agencies, as well as all consumer protection agencies.

Now, some will say that Congress can change the CFPB's funding structure at any time so there is really no problem with the structure. Well, this is ridiculous. This is absurd.

Our Constitution does not permit elected Representatives in Congress to delegate away our authority, which is textually reserved to the Congress, to some other branch of government or an executive branch official. It requires that the key decisions remain in the hands of the elected Representatives of the people.

Congress cannot delegate away its responsibilities without undermining the separation of powers, even if it could pass legislation to retake such responsibilities in the future.

Instead, it is the Supreme Court's duty to strike down laws that violate

the Constitution, even if Congress could remedy those violations. For example, the Supreme Court strikes down laws that violate the First Amendment or the Commerce Clause, even though Congress could remedy those violations. There is no reason why the same should not be true of laws that violate the appropriations clause.

Moreover, in Seila Law, the Court struck down the infringement of the President's removal power over the director of the CFPB. I hope now it protects Congress' power as it did the President's power in Seila Law.

After all, the Supreme Court's role is not just to prevent the erosion of presidential powers but also Congress' power. The reason the CFPB's funding structure is so problematic is that when Congress delegates its core responsibilities away to administrative agencies, the value of each American's vote is diminished.

As Congress has delegated more responsibilities and more authorities to administrative agencies, Americans have come to increasingly believe that their votes do not matter. They see that changes in Congress don't change policies set by agencies.

Lack of congressional control over the CFPB creates the opportunity for special interests to capture the CFPB who run the agency according to their own ideological vision, not according to the will of the American people. Changing the CFPB's funding structure would be an important and commonsense step in restoring faith in our democracy.

It is important to recognize that the structure of the CFPB is an aberration in our government. No other agency is funded by the Federal Reserve at the level set by the director of the other agency.

Now, I know a lot of people have raised concerns that striking down the funding structure of the bureau would open up the question of constitutionality of the Federal Reserve and a few other agencies that are funded through assessments or other funding streams that they incur in their operations.

The funding structure of the CFPB is unique. Unlike other agencies that may be funded by a specific source of funding that they raise in the course of their operations—seigniorage in the case of the Federal Reserve; fees on banks in the case of the Comptroller of the Currency; deposit insurance premiums in the case of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; tariff revenue in the case of the Customs Service—the CFPB is different. There is no analog. It determines its own funding by taking funds from the Federal Reserve. No other agency obtains its funding by taking funds in this way. Further, there is no nexus between its statutory responsibilities, consumer protection, and its funding source, the Federal Reserve.

In conclusion, while there has been much debate about where to draw the

constitutional line on how agencies can be funded consistent with the appropriations clause, the funding structure of the CFPB is one we should all agree goes too far.

As with the Supreme Court determination in the Free Enterprise Fund case that double insulation on removal was too far with respect to limits on the presidential removal authority, the same should apply here.

The funding structure of the CFPB goes too far without having to answer or raise questions about other agencies. Granting Federal agencies the authority to derive their funding from the Federal Reserve outside of the appropriations process is a dangerous precedent and is fundamentally inconsistent with the Constitution's separation of powers.

The Federal Reserve seigniorage for money creation is not a piggy bank. Forcing the Federal Reserve to pay for other government operations risks compromising the Fed's monetary policy independence.

For these reasons, I urge the Supreme Court of the United States to do the right thing: to vindicate the separation of powers and to uphold Congress' appropriations authority over Federal executive branch agencies.

I urge my colleagues to remedy this constitutional defect, pass the Womack appropriations bill, pass the TABS Act, and restore congressional appropriations authority.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Mr. BARR for his kind remarks and for his hard work in drafting the TABS Act. We are pleased to include it in this year's Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill.

Let me add that I fully agree with your assessment of the importance of making the CFPB part of the annual appropriations process.

As you noted, most agencies are funded by Congress, including all the traditional consumer protection agencies, as you have articulated.

I also agree with you that the purpose of this legislation is to uphold the Constitution. I mean, that is our oath. That is what we swear to on January 3 every other year. This is a principled action. It is not an effort to kill the CFPB. That is why this bill funds the CFPB at the level it receives now.

We merely want to create an accountable funding structure for the CFPB that is like all other consumer protection agencies. That is why I will not support the amendment to eliminate the funding. That is why this is about constitutional principles, not the CFPB's existence.

Finally, let me say the Appropriations Committee has a critical constitutional responsibility to oversee how the Federal Government spends taxpayer dollars.

The annual process is the mechanism whereby our democracy ensures that the people's priorities are reflected in

how taxpayer dollars are allocated and spent. It is my hope the Supreme Court recognizes this fact and strikes down the funding structure of the CFPB.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me say I am sympathetic to the issue that the appropriations committee needs to conduct oversight, but I will tell everybody in this Chamber and those who are watching, this matter was a subject of very serious debate and resolution, and the resolution was we wanted to keep this agency independent and free of any political pressure.

It was adopted on that basis by the House and the Senate and signed by the President of the United States. It is now the subject of a Supreme Court hearing.

This is authorizing in the extreme an appropriation bill which, but for the waiver that was issued by the Rules Committee, a point of order would be applicable and would not be considered.

I suggest that this is an authorizing matter. It is a matter that the Financial Services Committee needs to be seized of and report the gentleman's legislation out to the floor and that ought to be considered in the regular order.

This is not the regular order for a major authorizing change, which was very controversial at the time it was raised, and it was passed to make sure that consumers are, in fact, protected and insulated from political pressure.

Therefore, at such time, I will support an amendment to take this from the bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address our country's urgent need for a Supreme Court code of ethics. Over the past year, we have seen troubling reports of Justices receiving lavish gifts from political donors with connections to cases before the Supreme Court and who stand to benefit from rulings.

This is unacceptable and unethical, and it has undermined public trust in the institution. It is time for the Supreme Court to adopt and abide by a judicial code of ethics.

Currently, all Federal judges must abide by a code of ethics except for Supreme Court Justices. That must change.

I introduced an amendment to the Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill that would withhold \$10 million in funding from the Supreme Court until the Justices adopt a code of ethics.

This amendment, which I introduced with Congressman HANK JOHNSON, would have restored public confidence in this institution.

It would have helped to solve one of the many problems our voters sent us to Washington, D.C., to fix—the corrupt power of money and politics in our judicial system.

Sadly, Republicans on the Rules Committee would not even consider my amendment in order. We must do better.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief in response to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, who makes the arguments that the authors of the Dodd-Frank law made, which was that we designed this to be independent. Well, that is fine. That is what they wanted, but they can't do it unconstitutionally.

As the Fifth Circuit said very, very well, while the defenders of the structure of the agency, of the CFPB, contend that there is no constitutional infirmity because the funding scheme was actually enacted by Congress in the Dodd-Frank law, and, therefore, it is constitutional.

In essence, the bureau contends that because Congress spun the agency's funding mechanism into motion when it passed the act, voila, the appropriations clause is satisfied.

That is not the way the Constitution works, Mr. Chair. This body cannot unconstitutionally delegate away our most fundamental power, which is the power of the purse.

Vote for the Womack appropriations bill. Restore the power of the purse. Defend this institution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chair if he has any more speakers?

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to close.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Number one on this issue—it is pending before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court can decide whether it is constitutional or not. We can't decide whether something is constitutional or not. Ultimately the Supreme Court decides that.

We pass laws, and we certainly hope and expect them to be constitutional. I would, again, reiterate my opposition to the gentleman's amendment on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say this bill underfunds the most important aspect of the Federal Government, and that is collecting the revenues to run it in a balanced way. It undermines that effort. I urge opposition to the bill.

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

□ 1015

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I stated in my opening, I have great respect for my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and his team over there. They do their work in accordance with what they feel are the emerging issues facing our country. We do the same on our side.

Suffice it to say, though, what we need right now is a bill on this floor

that we can use as a basis to go negotiate with our Senate counterparts at the other end of this Capitol and, hopefully, come up with a conference report that we can all live with.

We know that the clock is running. America knows that, on November 17, we are going to have a continuing resolution of some form to be able to continue the work of this appropriations process. A lot of work has gone into it. We can have our differences. Those are well stated, as evidenced by the debate this morning, but we need to finish our work.

We will have a big amendment process going on throughout the day today, tonight, and into tomorrow, but we need right now to finish our work on this bill, get it across the finish line, make it a basis for negotiation in the Senate, get a conference report, and finish at least this portion of the 12-bill appropriations work. That is what we are responsible for doing here today.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROUZER). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in part A of House Report 118-269 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4664

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Freedman's Bank Building; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business; executive direction program activities; international affairs and economic policy activities; domestic finance and tax policy activities, including technical assistance to State, local, and territorial entities; and Treasury-wide management policies and programs activities, \$248,109,000, of which not less than \$9,000,000 shall be available for the administration of financial assistance, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used to support the activities of the Federal Insurance Office: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading—

(1) not to exceed \$350,000 is for official reception and representation expenses;

(2) not to exceed \$258,000 is for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate; and

(3) not to exceed \$34,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2025, for—

(A) the Treasury-wide Financial Statement Audit and Internal Control Program;

(B) information technology modernization requirements;

(C) the audit, oversight, and administration of the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund;

(D) the development and implementation of programs within the Office of Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection, including entering into cooperative agreements;

(E) operations and maintenance of facilities; and

(F) international operations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, \$21,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the chairperson of the Committee may transfer such amounts to any department or agency represented on the Committee (including the Department of the Treasury) subject to advance notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended for expenses of implementing section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. 4565), and shall be available in addition to any other funds available to any department or agency: *Provided further*, That fees authorized by section 721(p) of such Act shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections: *Provided further*, That the total amount appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2024, so as to result in a total appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

OFFICE OF TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the necessary expenses of the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence to safeguard the financial system against illicit use and to combat rogue nations, terrorist facilitators, weapons of mass destruction proliferators, human rights abusers, money launderers, drug kingpins, and other national security threats, \$206,842,000, of which not less than \$3,000,000 shall be available for addressing human rights violations and corruption, including activities authorized by the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 2656 note): *Provided*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, up to \$16,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2025.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT

For salaries and expenses for enhanced cybersecurity for systems operated by the Department of the Treasury, \$150,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026: *Provided*, That such funds shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts made available to the Treasury offices and bureaus for cybersecurity: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$7,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses for the Treasury Chief Information Officer to provide oversight of the investments made under this heading: *Provided further*, That such funds shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts made available to the Treasury Chief Information Officer.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE SYSTEMS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENTS PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services and for repairs and renovations to buildings owned by the Department of the Treasury, \$14,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026: *Provided*, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to support or supplement "Internal Revenue Service, Operations Support" or "Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization".

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of chapter 4 of title 5, United States Code, \$43,000,000, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury; of which up to \$2,800,000 to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be for audits and investigations conducted pursuant to section 1608 of the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (33 U.S.C. 1321 note); and of which not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Inspector General for Tax Administration; \$170,250,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2025; of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be available for official travel expenses; of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration; and of which not to exceed \$1,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and training expenses of non-Federal and foreign government personnel to attend meetings and training concerned with domestic and foreign financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$166,000,000, of which not to exceed \$55,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2026.

BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of operations of the Bureau of the Fiscal Service, \$368,155,000; of

which not to exceed \$8,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, is for information systems modernization initiatives; and of which \$5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

In addition, \$225,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to reimburse administrative and personnel expenses for financial management of the Fund, as authorized by section 1012 of Public Law 101-380.

ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX AND TRADE BUREAU

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of carrying out section 1111 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$135,038,000; of which not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; and of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for cooperative research and development programs for laboratory services; and provision of laboratory assistance to State and local agencies with or without reimbursement: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be for the costs of accelerating the processing of formula and label applications: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be for the costs associated with enforcement of and education regarding the trade practice provisions of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (27 U.S.C. 201 et seq.).

UNITED STATES MINT

UNITED STATES MINT PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND

Pursuant to section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, the United States Mint is provided funding through the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund for costs associated with the production of circulating coins, numismatic coins, and protective services, including both operating expenses and capital investments: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of new liabilities and obligations incurred during fiscal year 2024 under such section 5136 for circulating coinage and protective service capital investments of the United States Mint shall not exceed \$50,000,000.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (subtitle A of title I of Public Law 103-325), including services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for EX-III, \$278,617,000. Of the amount appropriated under this heading—

(1) not less than \$170,000,000, notwithstanding section 108(e) of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(e)) with regard to Small and/or Emerging Community Development Financial Institutions Assistance awards, is available until September 30, 2025, for financial assistance and technical assistance under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 108(a)(1), respectively, of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(a)(1)(A) and (B)), of which up to \$1,600,000 may be available for training and outreach under section 109 of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4708), of which up to \$3,153,750 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and of which up to \$10,000,000, notwithstanding subsection (d) of section 108 of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(d)), may be available to provide financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach to community development financial institutions to expand investments that benefit individuals with disabilities: *Provided*, That the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, in-

cluding the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$25,000,000: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this paragraph, excluding those made to community development financial institutions to expand investments that benefit individuals with disabilities and those made to community development financial institutions that serve populations living in persistent poverty counties, the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund shall prioritize Financial Assistance awards to organizations that invest and lend in high-poverty areas: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term "high-poverty area" means any census tract with a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2016-2020 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census for all States and Puerto Rico or with a poverty rate of at least 20 percent as measured by the 2010 Island areas Decennial Census data for any territory or possession of the United States;

(2) not less than \$30,000,000, notwithstanding section 108(e) of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(e)), is available until September 30, 2025, for financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach programs designed to benefit Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native communities and provided primarily through qualified community development lender organizations with experience and expertise in community development banking and lending in Indian country, Native American organizations, Tribes and Tribal organizations, and other suitable providers;

(3) not less than \$35,000,000 is available until September 30, 2025, for the Bank Enterprise Award program;

(4) not less than \$5,000,000, notwithstanding subsections (d) and (e) of section 108 of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(d) and (e)), is available until September 30, 2025, for a Healthy Food Financing Initiative to provide financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach to community development financial institutions for the purpose of offering affordable financing and technical assistance to expand the availability of healthy food options in distressed communities;

(5) not less than \$5,000,000 is available until September 30, 2025, to provide grants for loan loss reserve funds and to provide technical assistance for small dollar loan programs under section 122 of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4719): *Provided*, That sections 108(d) and 122(b)(2) of such Public Law shall not apply to the provision of such grants and technical assistance;

(6) up to \$33,617,000 is available for administrative expenses, including administration of Community Development Financial Institutions Fund programs and the New Markets Tax Credit Program, of which not less than \$1,000,000 is for the development of tools to better assess and inform Community Development Financial Institutions investment performance and Community Development Financial Institutions program impacts, and up to \$300,000 is for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program; and

(7) during fiscal year 2024, none of the funds available under this heading are available for the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of commitments to guarantee bonds and notes under section 114A of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4713a): *Provided*, That commitments to guarantee bonds and notes

under such section 114A shall not exceed \$500,000,000: *Provided further*, That such section 114A shall remain in effect until December 31, 2024: *Provided further*, That of the funds awarded under this heading, not less than 10 percent shall be used for awards that support investments that serve populations living in persistent poverty counties: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (1), the term “persistent poverty counties” means any county, including county equivalent areas in Puerto Rico, that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses and the 2016–2020 five-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census or any other territory or possession of the United States that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990, 2000 and 2010 Island Areas Decennial Censuses, or equivalent data, of the Bureau of the Census.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
TAXPAYER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to provide taxpayer services, including pre-filing assistance and education, filing and account services, taxpayer advocacy services, and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, \$2,780,606,000, of which not to exceed \$100,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2025, of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program, of which not less than \$28,000,000 shall be available for low-income taxpayer clinic grants, including grants to individual clinics of up to \$200,000, of which not less than \$40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, shall be available for the Community Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Matching Grants Program for tax return preparation assistance, and of which not less than \$271,200,000 shall be available for operating expenses of the Taxpayer Advocate Service: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available for the Taxpayer Advocate Service, not less than \$7,000,000 shall be for identity theft and refund fraud casework.

ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for tax enforcement activities of the Internal Revenue Service to determine and collect owed taxes, to provide legal and litigation support, to conduct criminal investigations, to enforce criminal statutes related to violations of internal revenue laws and other financial crimes, to purchase and hire passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)), and to provide other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, \$4,206,180,000; of which not to exceed \$250,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2025; of which not less than \$60,257,000 shall be for the Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement program; and of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be for investigative technology for the Criminal Investigation Division: *Provided*, That the amount made available for investigative technology for the Criminal Investigation Division shall be in addition to amounts made available for the Criminal Investigation Division under the “Operations Support” heading.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT

For necessary expenses to operate the Internal Revenue Service to support taxpayer services and enforcement programs, including rent payments; facilities services; printing; postage; physical security; headquarters and other IRS-wide administration activi-

ties; research and statistics of income; telecommunications; information technology development, enhancement, operations, maintenance and security; the hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); the operations of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board; and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; \$4,100,826,000, of which not to exceed \$275,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2025; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall remain available until expended for acquisition of equipment and construction, repair and renovation of facilities; of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2026, for research; and of which not to exceed \$20,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Internal Revenue Service shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General of the United States detailing major information technology investments in the Internal Revenue Service Integrated Modernization Business Plan portfolio, including detailed, plain language summaries on the status of plans, costs, and results; prior results and actual expenditures of the prior quarter; upcoming deliverables and costs for the fiscal year; risks and mitigation strategies associated with ongoing work; reasons for any cost or schedule variances; and total expenditures by fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Internal Revenue Service shall include, in its budget justification for fiscal year 2025, a summary of cost and schedule performance information for its major information technology systems.

BUSINESS SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service’s business systems modernization program, \$150,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2026, and shall be for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including related Internal Revenue Service labor costs, and contractual costs associated with operations authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Internal Revenue Service shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General of the United States detailing major information technology investments in the Internal Revenue Service Integrated Modernization Business Plan portfolio, including detailed, plain language summaries on the status of plans, costs, and results; prior results and actual expenditures of the prior quarter; upcoming deliverables and costs for the fiscal year; risks and mitigation strategies associated with ongoing work; reasons for any cost or schedule variances; and total expenditures by fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

SEC. 101. The Internal Revenue Service shall maintain an employee training program, which shall include the following topics: taxpayers’ rights, dealing courteously with taxpayers, cross-cultural relations, ethics, and the impartial application of tax law.

SEC. 102. The Internal Revenue Service shall institute and enforce policies and procedures that will safeguard the confidentiality of taxpayer information and protect taxpayers against identity theft.

SEC. 103. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be available for improved facilities

and increased staffing to provide sufficient and effective 1–800 help line service for taxpayers. The Commissioner shall continue to make improvements to the Internal Revenue Service 1–800 help line service a priority and allocate resources necessary to enhance the response time to taxpayer communications, particularly with regard to victims of tax-related crimes.

SEC. 104. The Internal Revenue Service shall issue a notice of confirmation of any address change relating to an employer making employment tax payments, and such notice shall be sent to both the employer’s former and new address and an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall give special consideration to an offer-in-compromise from a taxpayer who has been the victim of fraud by a third party payroll tax preparer.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to target citizens of the United States for exercising any right guaranteed under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to target groups for regulatory scrutiny based on their ideological beliefs.

SEC. 107. None of funds made available by this Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be obligated or expended on conferences that do not adhere to the procedures, verification processes, documentation requirements, and policies issued by the Chief Financial Officer, Human Capital Office, and Agency-Wide Shared Services as a result of the recommendations in the report published on May 31, 2013, by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration entitled “Review of the August 2010 Small Business/Self-Employed Division’s Conference in Anaheim, California” (Reference Number 2013–10–037).

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be obligated or expended—

(1) to make a payment to any employee under a bonus, award, or recognition program; or

(2) under any hiring or personnel selection process with respect to re-hiring a former employee; unless such program or process takes into account the conduct and Federal tax compliance of such employee or former employee.

SEC. 109. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to confidentiality and disclosure of returns and return information).

SEC. 110. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) may use the funds made available in this Act, subject to such policies as the Secretary (or the Secretary’s delegate) may establish, to utilize direct hire authority to recruit and appoint qualified applicants, without regard to any notice or preference requirements, directly to positions in the competitive service to process backlogged tax returns and return information.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding section 1344 of title 31, United States Code, funds appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service in this Act may be used to provide passenger carrier transportation and protection between the Commissioner of Internal Revenue’s residence and place of employment.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to develop or provide taxpayers a free, public electronic return-filing service option, without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, House Ways and Means Committee, and Senate Finance Committee.

SEC. 113. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase firearms or ammunition for the Internal Revenue Service above the levels in the possession of the Internal Revenue Service on July 13, 2023.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 114. Appropriations to the Department of the Treasury in this Act shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used overseas for the current fiscal year; entering into contracts with the Department of State for the furnishing of health and medical services to employees and their dependents serving in foreign countries; and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 115. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this title made available under the headings “Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses”, “Office of Inspector General”, “Financial Crimes Enforcement Network”, “Bureau of the Fiscal Service”, and “Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau” may be transferred between such appropriations upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That no transfer under this section may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 116. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration’s appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 117. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise available to the Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Engraving and Printing may be used to redesign the \$1 Federal Reserve note.

SEC. 118. The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer funds from the “Bureau of the Fiscal Service—Salaries and Expenses” to the Debt Collection Fund as necessary to cover the costs of debt collection: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be reimbursed to such salaries and expenses account from debt collections received in the Debt Collection Fund.

SEC. 119. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used by the United States Mint to construct or operate any museum without the explicit approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Financial Services, and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SEC. 120. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act or source to the Department of the Treasury, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the United States Mint, individually or collectively, may be used to consolidate any or all functions of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the United States Mint without the explicit approval of the House Committee on Financial Services; the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 121. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in

this Act, for the Department of the Treasury’s intelligence or intelligence related activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2024 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024.

SEC. 122. Not to exceed \$5,000 shall be made available from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing’s Industrial Revolving Fund for necessary official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 123. The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a Capital Investment Plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days following the submission of the annual budget submitted by the President: *Provided*, That such Capital Investment Plan shall include capital investment spending from all accounts within the Department of the Treasury, including but not limited to the Department-wide Systems and Capital Investment Programs account, Treasury Franchise Fund account, and the Treasury Forfeiture Fund account: *Provided further*, That such Capital Investment Plan shall include expenditures occurring in previous fiscal years for each capital investment project that has not been fully completed.

SEC. 124. During fiscal year 2024—

(1) none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by the Department of the Treasury, including the Internal Revenue Service, to issue, revise, or finalize any regulation, revenue ruling, or other guidance not limited to a particular taxpayer relating to the standard which is used to determine whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (including the proposed regulations published at 78 Fed. Reg. 71535 (November 29, 2013)); and

(2) the standard and definitions as in effect on January 1, 2010, which are used to make such determinations shall apply after the date of the enactment of this Act for purposes of determining status under section 501(c)(4) of such Code of organizations created on, before, or after such date.

SEC. 125. Within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an itemized report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the amount of total funds charged to each office by the Franchise Fund including the amount charged for each service provided by the Franchise Fund to each office, a detailed description of the services, a detailed explanation of how each charge for each service is calculated, and a description of the role customers have in governing in the Franchise Fund.

SEC. 126. (a) Not later than 60 days after the end of each quarter, the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall submit reports on their activities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

(b) The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the obligations made during the previous quarter by object class, office, and activity;

(2) the estimated obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year by object class, office, and activity;

(3) the number of full-time equivalents within each office during the previous quarter;

(4) the estimated number of full-time equivalents within each office for the remainder of the fiscal year; and

(5) actions taken to achieve the goals, objectives, and performance measures of each office.

(c) At the request of any such Committees specified in subsection (a), the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall make officials available to testify on the contents of the reports required under subsection (a).

SEC. 127. In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated to the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses in carrying out section 4018 of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136).

SEC. 128. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to provide bonuses, raises, or promotions to any employee of the Department of Treasury until the Secretary produces a COVID-19 National Emergency expenditure report as required by section 401(c) of Public Law 94-412.

SEC. 129. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve, license, facilitate, authorize, or otherwise allow, whether by general or specific license, travel-related or other transactions incident to non-educational exchanges described in section 515.565(b) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 130. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a joint report not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act regarding travel pursuant to sections 515.565(b), 515.560(a)(1), 515.560(c)(4)(i), and 515.561 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 131. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Treasury to establish a United States Central Bank Digital Currency or discontinue circulation or use of paper currency as legal tender in the United States.

SEC. 132. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to implement or promulgate beneficial ownership reporting rules pursuant to Division F of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, Public Law 116-283, January 1, 2021, that do not reflect Congressional intent.

SEC. 133. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the single-family mortgage credit fee pricing framework of the enterprises announced by the Federal Housing Finance Agency on January 19, 2023.

SEC. 134. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement an outbound investment review, prohibition, or notification program until the Assistant Secretary of Treasury for Investment Security and equivalents from CFIUS member agencies provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations and Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations and Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that contains the following—

(1) A comprehensive list of Chinese technologies covered by the program that have been developed as a result of United States investments, including a description of the technologies’ specifications.

(2) The value of United States private equity and venture capital investments in any specific Chinese technologies that would be subject to prohibitions under the program, in absolute and relative terms with respect to non-United States investment.

(3) A detailed description of know-how or other essential information that has been

transferred by United States investors in support of Chinese technologies covered by the program, including an assessment of whether the information was available to non-United States persons or eligible for potential control under the Export Control Reform Act.

(4) An analysis of any estimated delay to China's development of program-related technologies as a direct result of the program's implementation.

(5) Any legislative or regulatory proposals to impose secondary sanctions involving investments by foreign persons in Chinese technologies covered by the program.

(6) A detailed evaluation of the effectiveness of investment restrictions administered by the Department of the Treasury with respect to Chinese Military Industrial-Complex Companies.

This title may be cited as the "Department of the Treasury Appropriations Act, 2024".

TITLE II

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the White House as authorized by law, including not to exceed \$3,850,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 105; subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 105, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; hire of passenger motor vehicles, and travel (not to exceed \$100,000 to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 103); and not to exceed \$19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be available for allocation within the Executive Office of the President; and for necessary expenses of the Office of Policy Development, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, \$55,000,000.

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, \$14,050,000, to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 105, 109, 110, and 112–114.

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

For the reimbursable expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, such amount for reimbursable operating expenses shall be the exclusive authority of the Executive Residence to incur obligations and to receive offsetting collections, for such expenses: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall require each person sponsoring a reimbursable political event to pay in advance an amount equal to the estimated cost of the event, and all such advance payments shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall require the national committee of the political party of the President to maintain on deposit \$25,000, to be separately accounted for and available for expenses relating to reimbursable political events sponsored by such committee during such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall ensure that a written notice of any amount owed for a reimbursable operating expense under this paragraph is submitted to the person owing such amount within 60 days after such expense is incurred, and that such amount is collected within 30 days after the submission

of such notice: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall charge interest and assess penalties and other charges on any such amount that is not reimbursed within such 30 days, in accordance with the interest and penalty provisions applicable to an outstanding debt on a United States Government claim under 31 U.S.C. 3717: *Provided further*, That each such amount that is reimbursed, and any accompanying interest and charges, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, by not later than 90 days after the end of the fiscal year covered by this Act, a report setting forth the reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence during the preceding fiscal year, including the total amount of such expenses, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable official and ceremonial events, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable political events, and the portion of each such amount that has been reimbursed as of the date of the report: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall maintain a system for the tracking of expenses related to reimbursable events within the Executive Residence that includes a standard for the classification of any such expense as political or nonpolitical: *Provided further*, That no provision of this paragraph may be construed to exempt the Executive Residence from any other applicable requirement of subchapter I or II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 105(d), \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended, for required maintenance, resolution of safety and health issues, and continued preventative maintenance.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Council of Economic Advisers in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.), \$4,120,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND HOMELAND SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Security Council and the Homeland Security Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$12,500,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administration, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$106,500,000, of which not to exceed \$12,800,000 shall remain available until expended for continued modernization of information resources within the Executive Office of the President: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, up to \$7,000,000 shall be available for a program to provide payments (such as stipends, subsistence allowances, cost reimbursements, or awards) to students, recent graduates, and veterans recently discharged from active duty who are performing voluntary services in the Executive Office of the President under section 3111(b) of title 5, United States Code, or comparable authority and shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available to pay or compensate such individuals: *Provided further*, That such payments shall not be considered compensation

for purposes of such section 3111(b) and may be paid in advance.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Management and Budget, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to carry out the provisions of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, and to prepare and submit the budget of the United States Government, in accordance with section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, \$116,000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be available for official representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Office of Management and Budget may be used for the purpose of reviewing any agricultural marketing orders or any activities or regulations under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the transcript of actual testimony of witnesses, except for testimony of officials of the Office of Management and Budget, before the Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate on Appropriations or their subcommittees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the annual work plan developed by the Corps of Engineers for submission to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or prior Acts shall be used, directly or indirectly, by the Office of Management and Budget, for evaluating or determining if water resource project or study reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers acting through the Secretary of the Army are in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and requirements relevant to the Civil Works water resource planning process: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget shall have not more than 60 days in which to perform budgetary policy reviews of water resource matters on which the Chief of Engineers has reported: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees when the 60-day review is initiated: *Provided further*, That if water resource reports have not been transmitted to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees within 15 days after the end of the Office of Management and Budget review period based on the notification from the Director, Congress shall assume Office of Management and Budget concurrence with the report and act accordingly: *Provided further*, That no later than 14 days after the submission of the budget of the United States Government for fiscal year 2025, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make publicly available on a website a tabular list for each agency that submits budget justification materials (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006) that shall include, at minimum, the name of the agency, the date on which the budget justification materials of the agency were submitted to Congress, and a uniform resource locator where the budget justification materials are published on the website of the agency: *Provided further*, That amounts appropriated under this heading shall be available for the liquidation of valid obligations incurred for fiscal year 2017, as authorized by law, in excess of amounts that were available for obligation during such fiscal year.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT
COORDINATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, as authorized by title III of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-403), including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,838,000.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the National Cyber Director, as authorized by section 1752 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), \$21,000,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; for research activities pursuant to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998, as amended; not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for participation in joint projects or in the provision of services on matters of mutual interest with nonprofit, research, or public organizations or agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$18,952,000: *Provided*, That the Office is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, both real and personal, public and private, without fiscal year limitation, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office.

FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS
HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS
PROGRAM
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$296,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the designated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("HIDTAs"), of which not less than \$280,741,415 shall be provided to the HIDTAs designated as of September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That each such designated HIDTAs shall receive an equal amount of funds from the total amount provided for such designated HIDTA: *Provided further*, That no less than 51 percent shall be transferred to State and local entities for drug control activities and shall be obligated not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That up to 49 percent may be transferred to Federal agencies and departments in amounts determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, of which up to \$4,000,000 may be used for auditing services and associated activities and \$1,500,000 shall be for the Grants Management System for use by the Office of National Drug Control Policy: *Provided further*, That any unexpended funds obligated prior to fiscal year 2022 may be used for any other approved activities of that HIDTA, subject to reprogramming requirements: *Provided further*, That each HIDTA designated as of September 30, 2023, shall be funded at not less than the fiscal year 2023 base level, unless the Director submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate justification for changes to those levels based on clearly articulated priorities and published Office of National Drug Control Policy performance measures of effectiveness: *Provided further*, That the Director shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the initial allocation of fiscal year 2024 funding among

HIDTAs not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, and shall notify the Committees of planned uses of discretionary HIDTA funding, as determined in consultation with the HIDTA Directors, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein and upon notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

OTHER FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For other drug control activities authorized by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998, as amended, \$135,450,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available as follows: \$109,000,000 for the Drug-Free Communities Program, of which not more than \$12,780,000 is for administrative expenses, and of which \$2,500,000 shall be made available as directed by section 4 of Public Law 107-82, as amended by section 8204 of Public Law 115-271; \$3,000,000 for drug court training and technical assistance; \$14,000,000 for anti-doping activities; up to \$3,000,000 for the United States membership dues to the World Anti-Doping Agency; \$1,250,000 for the Model Acts Program; and \$5,200,000 for activities authorized by section 103 of Public Law 114-198: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading may be transferred to other Federal departments and agencies to carry out such activities: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall, not fewer than 30 days prior to obligating funds under this heading for United States membership dues to the World Anti-Doping Agency, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spending plan and explanation of the proposed uses of these funds.

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to meet unanticipated needs, in furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 108, \$1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT AND
REFORM
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the furtherance of integrated, efficient, secure, and effective uses of information technology in the Federal Government, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may transfer these funds to one or more other agencies to carry out projects to meet these purposes.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 106, including subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 106, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$4,839,000.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
OPERATING EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the care, operation, refurbishing, improvement, and to the extent not otherwise

provided for, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the official residence of the Vice President; the hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$90,000 pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 106(b)(2), \$311,000: *Provided*, That advances, repayments, or transfers from this appropriation may be made to any department or agency for expenses of carrying out such activities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. From funds made available in this Act under the headings "The White House", "Executive Residence at the White House", "White House Repair and Restoration", "Council of Economic Advisers", "National Security Council and Homeland Security Council", "Office of Administration", "Special Assistance to the President", and "Official Residence of the Vice President", the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or such other officer as the President may designate in writing), may, with advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any such appropriation to any other such appropriation, to be merged with and available for the same time and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of an appropriation shall not be increased by more than 50 percent by such transfers: *Provided further*, That no amount shall be transferred from "Special Assistance to the President" or "Official Residence of the Vice President" without the approval of the Vice President.

SEC. 202. (a) During fiscal year 2024, any Executive order or Presidential memorandum issued or revoked by the President shall be accompanied by a written statement from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on the budgetary impact, including costs, benefits, and revenues, of such order or memorandum.

(b) Any such statement shall include—

(1) a narrative summary of the budgetary impact of such order or memorandum on the Federal Government;

(2) the impact on mandatory and discretionary obligations and outlays as the result of such order or memorandum, listed by Federal agency, for each year in the 5-fiscal-year period beginning in fiscal year 2024; and

(3) the impact on revenues of the Federal Government as the result of such order or memorandum over the 5-fiscal-year period beginning in fiscal year 2024.

(c) If an Executive order or Presidential memorandum is issued during fiscal year 2024 due to a national emergency, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may issue the statement required by subsection (a) not later than 15 days after the date that such order or memorandum is issued.

(d) The requirement for cost estimates for Presidential memoranda shall only apply for Presidential memoranda estimated to have a regulatory cost in excess of \$100,000,000.

SEC. 203. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue a memorandum to all Federal departments, agencies, and corporations directing compliance with the provisions in title VII of this Act.

SEC. 204. In fiscal year 2024 and each fiscal year thereafter—

(1) the Office of Management and Budget shall operate and maintain the automated system required to be implemented by section 204 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2022 (division E of Public Law 117-103) and shall

continue to post each document apportioning an appropriation, pursuant to section 1513(b) of title 31, United States Code, including any associated footnotes, in a format that qualifies each such document as an open Government data asset (as that term is defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code); and

(2) the requirements specified in subsection (c), the first and second provisos of subsection (d)(1), and subsection (d)(2) of such section 204 shall continue to apply.

SEC. 205. Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall conduct an audit of appropriations and issue a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate listing the unobligated amounts that remain available under the Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-123), the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (Public Law 116-127), the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136), the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act (Public Law 116-139), Divisions M and N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260), and the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-2).

SEC. 206. If, during fiscal year 2024 and each year thereafter, the President fails to submit to Congress the annual budget request to Congress on or before the first Monday in February as required by section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the total amount available for obligation under the heading ‘Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President’ during the fiscal year in which the President failed to make such submission shall be reduced by \$52,000,000 until the budget is submitted.

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ‘Office of Management and Budget’ may be used to issue any waiver or otherwise carry out section 265 of the Administrative Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2023 (title III of Public Law 118-5).

This title may be cited as the ‘Executive Office of the President Appropriations Act, 2024’.

TITLE III THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Supreme Court, as required by law, excluding care of the building and grounds, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for miscellaneous expenses, to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, \$124,201,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall remain available until expended.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of the court.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon the Architect by 40 U.S.C. 6111 and 6112 under the direction of the Chief Justice, \$20,420,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of officers and employees, and for necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, \$38,991,000.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief judge and judges of the court.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of officers and employees of the court, services, and necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, \$22,103,000.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief judge and judges of the court.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries of judges of the United States Court of Federal Claims, magistrate judges, and all other officers and employees of the Federal Judiciary not otherwise specifically provided for, necessary expenses of the courts, and the purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for Probation and Pretrial Services Office staff, as authorized by law, \$6,050,974,000 (including the purchase of firearms and ammunition); of which not to exceed \$27,817,000 shall remain available until expended for space alteration projects and for furniture and furnishings related to new space alteration and construction projects.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of circuit and district judges (including judges of the territorial courts of the United States), bankruptcy judges, and justices and judges retired from office or from regular active service.

In addition, for expenses of the United States Court of Federal Claims associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-660), not to exceed \$9,975,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For the operation of Federal Defender organizations; the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent persons under 18 U.S.C. 3006A and 3599, and for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of persons furnishing investigative, expert, and other services for such representations as authorized by law; the compensation (in accordance with the maximums under 18 U.S.C. 3006A) and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to assist the court in criminal cases where the defendant has waived representation by counsel; the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent jurors in civil actions for the protection of their employment, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1875(d)(1); the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed under 18 U.S.C. 983(b)(1) in connection with certain judicial civil forfeiture proceedings; the compensation and reimbursement of travel expenses of guardians ad litem appointed under 18 U.S.C. 4100(b); and for necessary training and general administrative expenses, \$1,411,116,000, to remain available until expended.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For fees and expenses of jurors as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1871 and 1876; compensation of jury commissioners as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1863; and compensation of commissioners appointed in condemnation cases pursuant to rule 71.1(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (28 U.S.C. Appendix Rule 71.1(h)), \$59,902,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the compensation of land commissioners shall not exceed the

daily equivalent of the highest rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5332.

COURT SECURITY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the provision of protective guard services for United States courthouses and other facilities housing Federal court or Administrative Office of the United States Courts operations, the procurement, installation, and maintenance of security systems and equipment for United States courthouses and other facilities housing Federal court or Administrative Office of the United States Courts operations, building ingress-egress control, inspection of mail and packages, directed security patrols, perimeter security, basic security services provided by the Federal Protective Service, and other similar activities as authorized by section 1010 of the Judicial Improvement and Access to Justice Act (Public Law 100-702), \$782,727,000, of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended, to be expended directly or transferred to the United States Marshals Service, which shall be responsible for administering the Judicial Facility Security Program consistent with standards or guidelines agreed to by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the Attorney General: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading may be used for managing a Judiciary-wide program to facilitate security and emergency management services among the Judiciary, United States Marshals Service, Federal Protective Service, General Services Administration, other Federal agencies, state and local governments and the public; and for purposes authorized by the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2022 (Public Law 117-263, Division C, Title LIX, subtitle D) and 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(24).

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as authorized by law, including travel as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1345, hire of a passenger motor vehicle as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b), advertising and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$107,295,000, of which not to exceed \$8,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Judicial Center, as authorized by Public Law 90-219, \$34,174,000; of which \$1,800,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2025, to provide education and training to Federal court personnel; and of which not to exceed \$1,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 58 of title 28, United States Code, \$22,503,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 302. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Judiciary in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations,

but no such appropriation, except “Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Defender Services” and “Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Fees of Jurors and Commissioners”, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under sections 604 and 608 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in section 608.

SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the salaries and expenses appropriation for “Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services” shall be available for official reception and representation expenses of the Judicial Conference of the United States: *Provided*, That such available funds shall not exceed \$11,000 and shall be administered by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in the capacity as Secretary of the Judicial Conference.

SEC. 304. Section 3315(a) of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “Federal” for “executive” each place it appears.

SEC. 305. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. 561-569, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Marshals Service shall provide, for such courthouses as its Director may designate in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for purposes of a pilot program, the security services that 40 U.S.C. 1315 authorizes the Department of Homeland Security to provide, except for the services specified in 40 U.S.C. 1315(b)(2)(E). For building-specific security services at these courthouses, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall reimburse the United States Marshals Service rather than the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 306. Section 3006A(d)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, or the attorney’s law firm,” after “appointed pursuant to this section”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or the attorney’s law firm,” after “paid to an attorney” each place it appears;

(C) in paragraph (5), by inserting “, or the attorney’s law firm” after “paid to the attorney”; and

(2) in subsection (f), by inserting “, or the attorney’s law firm” after “paid to the appointed attorney”.

SEC. 307. (a) Section 203(c) of the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-650; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended in the matter following paragraph 12—

(1) in the second sentence (relating to the District of Kansas), by striking “32 years and 6 months” and inserting “33 years and 6 months”; and

(2) in the sixth sentence (relating to the District of Hawaii), by striking “29 years and 6 months” and inserting “30 years and 6 months”.

(b) Section 406 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-115; 119 Stat. 2470; 28 U.S.C. 133 note) is amended in the second sentence (relating to the eastern District of Missouri) by striking “30 years and 6 months” and inserting “31 years and 6 months”.

(c) Section 312(c)(2) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (Public Law 107-273; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking “21 years” and inserting “22 years”;

(2) in the second sentence (relating to the central District of California), by striking “20 years and 6 months” and inserting “21 years and 6 months”; and

(3) in the third sentence (relating to the western district of North Carolina), by striking “19 years” and inserting “20 years”.

This title may be cited as the “Judiciary Appropriations Act, 2024”.

TITLE IV
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia, to be deposited into a dedicated account, for a nationwide program to be administered by the Mayor, for District of Columbia resident tuition support, \$40,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds, including any interest accrued thereon, may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, or to pay up to \$2,500 each year at eligible private institutions of higher education: *Provided further*, That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident’s academic merit, the income and need of eligible students and such other factors as may be authorized: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia government shall maintain a dedicated account for the Resident Tuition Support Program that shall consist of the Federal funds appropriated to the Program in this Act and any subsequent appropriations, any unobligated balances from prior fiscal years, and any interest earned in this or any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the account shall be under the control of the District of Columbia Chief Financial Officer, who shall use those funds solely for the purposes of carrying out the Resident Tuition Support Program: *Provided further*, That the Office of the Chief Financial Officer shall provide a quarterly financial report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for these funds showing, by object class, the expenditures made and the purpose therefor.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For a Federal payment of necessary expenses, as determined by the Mayor of the District of Columbia in written consultation with the elected county or city officials of surrounding jurisdictions, \$28,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the costs of providing public safety at events related to the presence of the National Capital in the District of Columbia, including support requested by the Director of the United States Secret Service in carrying out protective duties under the direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for the costs of providing support to respond to immediate and specific terrorist threats or attacks in the District of Columbia or surrounding jurisdictions.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For salaries and expenses for the District of Columbia Courts, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, \$301,210,000 to be allocated as follows: for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, \$15,655,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, \$144,035,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; for the District of Columbia Court

System, \$90,210,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; and \$51,310,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities: *Provided*, That funds made available for capital improvements shall be expended consistent with the District of Columbia Courts master plan study and facilities condition assessment: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the amounts appropriated herein, fees received by the District of Columbia Courts for administering bar examinations and processing District of Columbia bar admissions may be retained and credited to this appropriation, to remain available until expended, for salaries and expenses associated with such activities, notwithstanding section 450 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-204.50): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That 30 days after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the District of Columbia Courts may reallocate not more than \$9,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading among the items and entities funded under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia may, by regulation, establish a program substantially similar to the program set forth in subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, for employees of the District of Columbia Courts.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR DEFENDER SERVICES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For payments authorized under section 11-2604 and section 11-2605, D.C. Official Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act), payments for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, D.C. Official Code, or pursuant to contractual agreements to provide guardian ad litem representation, training, technical assistance, and such other services as are necessary to improve the quality of guardian ad litem representation, payments for counsel appointed in adoption proceedings under chapter 3 of title 16, D.C. Official Code, and payments authorized under section 21-2060, D.C. Official Code (relating to services provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986), \$46,005,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided under this heading shall be administered by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, this appropriation shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations made available under this heading, \$25,000,000, are hereby rescinded not later than September 30, 2024.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For salaries and expenses, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, of the

Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, \$287,271,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 is for official reception and representation expenses related to Community Supervision and Pretrial Services Agency programs, and of which not to exceed \$25,000 is for dues and assessments relating to the implementation of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Interstate Supervision Act of 2002: *Provided*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$202,289,000 shall be for necessary expenses of Community Supervision and Sex Offender Registration, to include expenses relating to the supervision of adults subject to protection orders or the provision of services for or related to such persons, of which \$4,253,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2026, for costs associated with the relocation under replacement leases for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$84,982,000 shall be available to the Pretrial Services Agency, of which \$2,503,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2026, for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading may be used for programmatic incentives for defendants to successfully complete their terms of supervision.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE

For salaries and expenses, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, \$57,329,000, of which \$3,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2026, for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Public Defender Service may establish for employees of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service a program substantially similar to the program set forth in subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, except that the maximum amount of the payment made under the program to any individual may not exceed the amount referred to in section 3523(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of engaging with, and receiving services from, Federal Franchise Fund Programs established in accordance with section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994, as amended, the District of Columbia Public Defender Service shall be considered an agency of the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Public Defender Service may enter into contracts for the procurement of severable services and multiyear contracts for the acquisition of property and services to the same extent and under the same conditions as an executive agency under sec-

tions 3902 and 3903 of title 41, United States Code.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

For a Federal payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, \$2,150,000, to remain available until expended, to support initiatives related to the coordination of Federal and local criminal justice resources in the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR JUDICIAL COMMISSIONS

For a Federal payment, to remain available until September 30, 2025, to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, \$330,000, and for the Judicial Nomination Commission, \$300,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

For a Federal payment for a school improvement program in the District of Columbia, \$52,500,000, to remain available until expended, for payments authorized under the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112-10): *Provided*, That, to the extent that funds are available for opportunity scholarships and following the priorities included in section 3006 of such Act, the Secretary of Education shall make scholarships available to students eligible under section 3013(3) of such Act (Public Law 112-10; 125 Stat. 211) including students who were not offered a scholarship during any previous school year: *Provided further*, That within funds provided for opportunity scholarships, up to \$1,750,000 shall be for the activities specified in sections 3007(b) through 3007(d) of the Act and up to \$500,000 shall be for the activities specified in section 3009 of the Act.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia National Guard, \$600,000, to remain available until expended for the Major General David F. Wherley, Jr. District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR TESTING AND TREATMENT OF HIV/AIDS

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for the testing of individuals for, and the treatment of individuals with, human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in the District of Columbia, \$4,000,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended, to continue implementation of the Combined Sewer Overflow Long-Term Plan: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority provides a 100 percent match for this payment.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

Local funds are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the General Fund of the District of Columbia (“General Fund”) for programs and activities set forth under the heading “District of Columbia Budget for the Fiscal Year ending September 30, 2024” and at the rate set forth under such heading, as included in the Fiscal Year 2024 Local Budget Act of 2023 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 450A of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (section 1-204.50a, D.C. Official Code), sections 816 and 817 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (secs. 47-369.01 and 47-369.02, D.C. Official Code),

and provisions of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for operating expenses for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2024 under this heading shall not exceed the estimates included in the Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request Act of 2023 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act or the sum of the total revenues of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated may be increased by proceeds of one-time transactions, which are expended for emergency or unanticipated operating or capital needs: *Provided further*, That such increases shall be approved by enactment of local District law and shall comply with all reserve requirements contained in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the District of Columbia meets these requirements, including the apportioning by the Chief Financial Officer of the appropriations and funds made available to the District during fiscal year 2024, except that the Chief Financial Officer may not reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

This title may be cited as the “District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2024”.

TITLE V

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Conference of the United States, authorized by 5 U.S.C. 591 et seq., \$3,523,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, of which not to exceed \$1,000 is for official reception and representation expenses.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the authorities of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, \$635,000,000 to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

SEC. 501. Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the heading of such subsection to read as follows: “BUDGET, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AND AUDIT.”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) of paragraph (1), as so redesignated;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau \$650,000,000 for fiscal year 2024 to carry out the authorities of the Bureau.”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

SEC. 502. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1011—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “in the Federal Reserve System.”; and

(ii) by striking “independent bureau” and inserting “independent agency”;

(B) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d);

(C) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (j);

(D) in subsection (j), as so redesignated, by striking “, including in cities in which the Federal reserve banks, or branches of such banks, are located.”; and

(E) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

“(b) AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS.—The commission of the Bureau may prescribe such regulations and issue such orders in accordance with this title as the Bureau may determine to be necessary for carrying out this title and all other laws within the Bureau’s jurisdiction and shall exercise any authorities granted under this title and all other laws within the Bureau’s jurisdiction.

“(c) COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The management of the Bureau shall be vested in a commission, which shall be composed of 5 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and at least 2 of whom shall have private sector experience in the provision of consumer financial products and services.

“(2) STAGGERING.—The members of the commission shall serve staggered terms, which initially shall be established by the President for terms of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively.

“(3) TERMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except with respect to the initial staggered terms described under paragraph (2), each member of the commission, including the Chair, shall serve for a term of 5 years.

“(B) REMOVAL.—The President may remove any member of the commission for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

“(C) VACANCIES.—Any member of the commission appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term to which that member’s predecessor was appointed (including the Chair) shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term.

“(D) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—Each member of the commission may continue to serve after the expiration of the term of office to which that member was appointed until a successor has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, except that a member may not continue to serve more than 1 year after the date on which the term of that member would otherwise expire.

“(E) OTHER EMPLOYMENT PROHIBITED.—No member of the commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

“(d) AFFILIATION.—Not more than three members of the commission shall be members of any one political party.

“(e) CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.—

“(1) INITIAL CHAIR.—The first member and Chair of the commission shall be the individual serving as Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection on the day before the date of the enactment of this subsection. Such individual shall serve until the President has appointed all 5 members of the commission in accordance with subsection (c).

“(2) SUBSEQUENT CHAIR.—Of the 5 members appointed in accordance with subsection (c), the President shall appoint 1 member to serve as the subsequent Chair of the commission.

“(3) AUTHORITY.—The Chair shall be the principal executive officer of the commission, and shall exercise all of the executive and administrative functions of the commission, including with respect to—

“(A) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the commission

(other than personnel employed regularly and full time in the immediate offices of members of the commission other than the Chair);

“(B) the distribution of business among personnel appointed and supervised by the Chair and among administrative units of the commission; and

“(C) the use and expenditure of funds.

“(4) LIMITATION.—In carrying out any of the Chair’s functions under the provisions of this subsection, the Chair shall be governed by general policies of the commission and by such regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations as the commission may by law be authorized to make.

“(5) REQUESTS OR ESTIMATES RELATED TO APPROPRIATIONS.—Requests or estimates for regular, supplemental, or deficiency appropriations on behalf of the commission may not be submitted by the Chair without the prior approval of the commission.

“(6) DESIGNATION.—The Chair shall be known as both the ‘Chair of the commission’ of the Bureau and the ‘Chair of the Bureau’.

“(f) INITIAL QUORUM ESTABLISHED.—For the 6 month period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection, the first member and Chair of the commission described under subsection (e)(1) shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business until the President has appointed all 5 members of the commission in accordance with subsection (c). Following such appointment of 5 members, the quorum requirements of subsection (g) shall apply.

“(g) NO IMPAIRMENT BY REASON OF VACANCIES.—No vacancy in the members of the commission after the establishment of an initial quorum under subsection (f) shall impair the right of the remaining members of the commission to exercise all the powers of the commission. Three members of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that if there are only 3 members serving on the commission because of vacancies in the commission, 2 members of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. If there are only 2 members serving on the commission because of vacancies in the commission, 2 members shall constitute a quorum for the 6-month period beginning on the date of the vacancy which caused the number of commission members to decline to 2.

“(h) SEAL.—The Bureau shall have an official seal.

“(i) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) CHAIR.—The Chair shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.—The 4 other members of the commission shall each receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.”;

(2) in section 1012(c)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “AUTONOMY OF THE BUREAU” and inserting “COORDINATION WITH THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS”;

(B) by striking “(1) COORDINATION WITH THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.”; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5); and

(3) in section 1014(b), by striking “Not fewer than 6 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the regional Federal Reserve Bank Presidents, on a rotating basis.” and inserting “Not fewer than half of all members shall have private sector experience in the provision of consumer financial products and services.”

(b) DEEMING OF NAME.—Any reference in a law, regulation, document, paper, or

other record of the United States to the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, except in subsection (e)(1) of section 1011 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491), as added by this Act, shall be deemed a reference to the commission leading and governing the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, as described under section 1011 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION ACT OF 2010.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(i) by striking “Director of the Bureau” each place such term appears, other than where such term is used to refer to a Director other than the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and inserting “Bureau”;

(ii) by striking “Director” each place such term appears and inserting “Bureau”, other than where such term is used to refer to a Director other than the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; and

(iii) in section 1002, by striking paragraph (10).

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(I) in section 1013(c)(3)—

(aa) by striking “Assistant Director of the Bureau for” and inserting “Head of the Office of”; and

(bb) in subparagraph (B), by striking “Assistant Director” and inserting “Head of the Office”;

(II) in section 1013(g)(2)—

(aa) by striking “ASSISTANT DIRECTOR” and inserting “HEAD OF THE OFFICE”; and

(bb) by striking “an assistant director” and inserting “a Head of the Office of Financial Protection for Older Americans”;

(III) in section 1016(a), by striking “Director of the Bureau” and inserting “Chair of the Bureau”; and

(IV) by striking section 1066.

(ii) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 1066.

(2) DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 111(b)(1)(D), by striking “Director” and inserting “Chair”; and

(B) in section 1447, by striking “Director of the Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Chair of the Bureau”.

(3) ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT.—Section 921(a)(4)(C) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o-2(a)(4)(C)), as added by section 1075(a)(2) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking “Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection” and inserting “Chair of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”.

(4) EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended by striking “Director of the Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Bureau”.

(5) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 2 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1812) is amended by striking “Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau” each place such term appears and inserting “Chair of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”.

(6) FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.—

Section 1004(a)(4) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303(a)(4)) is amended by striking “Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau” and inserting “Chair of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”.

(7) FINANCIAL LITERACY AND EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section 513 of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9702) is amended by striking “Director” each place such term appears and inserting “Chair”.

(8) HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975.—Section 307 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2806 et seq.) is amended by striking “Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”, each place such term appears and inserting “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”.

(9) INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT.—The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 1402—

(i) by striking paragraph (1); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (12) as paragraphs (1) through (11), respectively;

(B) in section 1403(c)—

(i) by striking “him” and inserting “the Bureau”; and

(ii) by striking “he” and inserting “the Bureau”;

(C) in section 1407—

(i) in subsection (c), by striking “he” and inserting “the Bureau”; and

(ii) in subsection (e), by striking “Director or anyone designated by him” and inserting “Bureau”;

(D) in section 1411(a)—

(i) by striking “his findings” and inserting “the findings of the Bureau”; and

(ii) by striking “his recommendation” and inserting “the recommendation of the Bureau”;

(E) in section 1415—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “he may, in his discretion,” and inserting “the Bureau may, in the discretion of the Bureau.”;

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) by striking “in his discretion” each place such term appears and inserting “in the discretion of the Bureau”;

(II) by striking “he deems” and inserting “the Bureau determines”; and

(III) by striking “he may deem” and inserting “the Bureau may determine”; and

(iii) in subsection (c), by striking “the Director, or any officer designated by him,” and inserting “the Bureau”;

(F) in section 1416(a)—

(i) by striking “Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection who may delegate any of his” and inserting “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, which may delegate any”;

(ii) by striking “his administrative” and inserting “administrative”; and

(iii) by striking “himself” and inserting “the commission of the Bureau”;

(G) in section 1418a(b)(4), by striking “Secretary’s determination” and inserting “determination of the Bureau”; and

(H) by striking “Director” each place such term appears and inserting “Bureau”.

(10) REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT OF 1974.—Section 5 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604) is amended—

(A) by striking “The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘Director’)” and inserting “The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘Bureau’)”; and

(B) by striking “Director” each place such term appears and inserting “Bureau”.

(11) S.A.F.E. MORTGAGE LICENSING ACT OF 2008.—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking “Director” each place such term appears in headings and text and inserting “Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection”; and

(B) in section 1503, by striking paragraph (10).

(12) TITLE 44, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 3513(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “Director of the”.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials’ contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$139,050,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall remain available until expended, to carry out the program, including administrative costs, required by section 1405 of the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act (Public Law 110-140; 15 U.S.C. 8004), and of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until expended, to carry out the program, including administrative costs, required by section 204 of the Nicholas and Zachary Burt Memorial Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act of 2022 (title II of division Q of Public Law 117-103).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SEC. 510. During fiscal year 2024, none of the amounts made available by this Act may be used to finalize or implement the Safety Standard for Recreational Off-Highway Vehicles published by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in the Federal Register on November 19, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 68964) until after—

(1) the National Academy of Sciences, in consultation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Department of Defense, completes a study to determine—

(A) the technical validity of the lateral stability and vehicle handling requirements proposed by such standard for purposes of reducing the risk of Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle (referred to in this section as “ROV”) rollovers in the off-road environment, including the repeatability and reproducibility of testing for compliance with such requirements;

(B) the number of ROV rollovers that would be prevented if the proposed requirements were adopted;

(C) whether there is a technical basis for the proposal to provide information on a point-of-sale hangtag about a ROV’s rollover resistance on a progressive scale; and

(D) the effect on the utility of ROVs used by the United States military if the proposed requirements were adopted; and

(2) a report containing the results of the study completed under paragraph (1) is delivered to—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 511. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to prohibit the use of or sale of gas-powered stoves, cooktops, ranges, or ovens in the United States.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-252), \$20,000,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall be made available to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for election reform activities authorized under the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$381,950,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$381,950,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2024 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2024 appropriation estimated at \$0: *Provided further*, That any offsetting collections received in excess of \$381,950,000 in fiscal year 2024 shall not be available for obligation: *Provided further*, That remaining offsetting collections from prior years collected in excess of the amount specified for collection in each such year and otherwise be coming available on October 1, 2023, shall not be available for obligation: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B), proceeds from the use of a competitive bidding system that may be retained and made available for obligation shall not exceed \$136,167,000 for fiscal year 2024: *Provided further*, That, of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than \$12,636,000 shall be for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SEC. 520. Section 302 of the Universal Service Antideficiency Temporary Suspension Act is amended by striking “December 31, 2023” each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2024”.

SEC. 521. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to modify, amend, or change its rules or regulations for universal service support payments to implement the February 27, 2004, recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service regarding single connection or primary line restrictions on universal service support payments.

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission or the Universal Service Administrative Company to update the currently applicable minimum service standards for fixed or mobile broadband Internet access services pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §54.408 without further consideration through notice and comment rulemaking procedures of the impact these minimum standards have on affordability and consumer choice and to reduce the support level pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §54.403(a)(2): *Provided*

further, That, the FCC shall consider through notice and comment rulemaking procedures the impact that the support level for voice service as set forth in 47 C.F.R. §54.403(a)(2) has on low-income consumers' access to public safety.

**FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL**

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$46,500,000, to be derived from the Deposit Insurance Fund or, only when appropriate, the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, \$74,500,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

**FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and including hire of experts and consultants, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$1,500) and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$28,000,000: *Provided*, That public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel may be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, and compensation as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received from fees charged to non-Federal participants at labor-management relations conferences shall be credited to and merged with this account, to be available without further appropriation for the costs of carrying out these conferences.

FEDERAL PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT STEERING COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IMPROVEMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of the Environmental Review Improvement Fund established pursuant to section 41009(d) of Public Law 114-94, \$9,775,000, to remain available until expended.

**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$376,530,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$300,000 shall be available for use to contract with a person or persons for collection services in accordance with the terms of 31 U.S.C. 3718: *Provided further*, That, not more than \$165,000,000 shall be for the Bureau of Competition: *Provided further*, That, none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission and used by the Bureau of Consumer Protection shall be reprogrammed to the Bureau of Competition: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$278,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary

expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$14,000,000 in offsetting collections derived from fees to implement and enforce the Telemarketing Sales Rule, promulgated under the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), shall be credited to this account, and be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2024 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2024 appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than \$84,530,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission may be used to implement subsection (e)(2)(B) of section 43 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831t).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SEC. 530. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to finalize, implement or enforce the rulemaking entitled "Motor Vehicle Dealers Trade Regulation Rule" (87 Fed. Reg. 42012 (July 13, 2022)).

SEC. 531. None of the funds in this Act may be used to finalize or enforce the "Trade Regulation on the Use of Earnings Claims" or the "Review of the Business Opportunity Rule" rulemakings without a clear statement of need or unless overlapping rulemaking and improvements in self-regulation and consumer protection of industries that would be impacted is considered.

SEC. 532. None of the funds in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the July 9, 2021 Statement of the Commission on the Withdrawal of the Statement of Enforcement Principles Regarding "Unfair Methods of Competition" under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

SEC. 533. None of the funds in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the October 25, 2021, Statement of the Commission on Use of Prior Approval Provisions in Merger Orders.

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES
FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND**

**LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

Amounts in the Fund, including revenues and collections deposited into the Fund, shall be available for necessary expenses of real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, including operation, maintenance, and protection of Federally owned and leased buildings; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving governmental agencies (including space adjustments and telecommunications relocation expenses) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of space; contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings, and moving; repair and alteration of Federally owned buildings, including grounds, approaches, and appurtenances; care and safeguarding of sites; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; acquisition of buildings and sites by purchase, condemnation, or as otherwise authorized by law; acquisition of options to purchase buildings and sites; conversion and extension of Federally owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects by contract or otherwise; construction of new buildings (including equipment for such buildings); and payment of principal, interest, and any other obligations for public buildings acquired by installment purchase and purchase contract; in the aggregate amount of \$9,297,817,000, of which—

(1) \$28,290,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and acquisition (including funds for sites and expenses, and associated design and construction services), in addition to amounts otherwise provided for such purposes, the San Juan, Clemente Ruiz-Nazario U.S. Courthouse and Federico Degetau Federal Building in Puerto Rico:

Provided, That each of the foregoing limits of costs on construction and acquisition projects may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other such projects, but not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts included in a transmitted prospectus, if required, unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of a greater amount;

(2) \$568,848,000 shall remain available until expended for repairs and alterations, including associated design and construction services, in addition to amounts otherwise provided for such purposes, of which—

(A) \$106,405,000 is for Major Repairs and Alterations as follows:

Kentucky:

Paducah, Federal Building and U.S. courthouse, \$40,479,000;

Oklahoma:

Oklahoma City, William J. Holloway, Jr. U.S. Courthouse and Post Office, \$65,926,000;

(B) \$388,710,000 is for Basic Repairs and Alterations; and

(C) \$73,733,000 is for Special Emphasis Programs:

Provided, That funds made available in this or any previous Act in the Federal Buildings Fund for Repairs and Alterations shall, for prospectus projects, be limited to the amount identified for each project, except each project in this or any previous Act may be increased by an amount not to exceed 20 percent unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of a greater amount: *Provided further*, That additional projects for which prospectuses have been fully approved may be funded under this category only if advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the amounts provided in this or any prior Act for "Repairs and Alterations" may be used to fund costs associated with implementing security improvements to buildings necessary to meet the minimum standards for security in accordance with current law and in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines of the appropriate Committees of the House and Senate: *Provided further*, That the difference between the funds appropriated and expended on any projects in this or any prior Act, under the heading "Repairs and Alterations", may be transferred to "Basic Repairs and Alterations" or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects: *Provided further*, That the amount provided in this or any prior Act for "Basic Repairs and Alterations" may be used to pay claims against the Government arising from any projects under the heading "Repairs and Alterations" or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects;

(3) \$5,719,298,000 for rental of space to remain available until expended; and

(4) \$2,981,381,000 for building operations to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total amount of funds made available from this Fund to the General Services Administration shall not be available for expenses of any construction, repair, alteration and acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required by 40 U.S.C. 3307(a), has not been approved, except that necessary

funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus: *Provided further*, That funds available in the Federal Buildings Fund may be expended for emergency repairs when advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That amounts necessary to provide reimbursable special services to other agencies under 40 U.S.C. 592(b)(2) and amounts to provide such reimbursable fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its protective functions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3056, shall be available from such revenues and collections: *Provided further*, That revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2024, excluding reimbursements under 40 U.S.C. 592(b)(2), in excess of the aggregate new obligatory authority authorized for Real Property Activities of the Federal Buildings Fund in this Act shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

GOVERNMENT-WIDE POLICY

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide policy associated with the management of real and personal property assets and certain administrative services; Government-wide policy support responsibilities relating to acquisition, travel, motor vehicles, information technology management, and related technology activities; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and evaluation activities as authorized by statute; \$68,720,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide activities associated with utilization and donation of surplus personal property; disposal of real property; agency-wide policy direction and management; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$50,955,000, of which not to exceed \$7,500 is for official reception and representation expenses.

CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for the activities associated with the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals, \$9,580,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$69,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available for information technology enhancements related to providing modern technology case management solutions: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for payment for information and detection of fraud against the Government, including payment for recovery of stolen Government property: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for awards to employees of other Federal agencies and private citizens in recognition of efforts and initiatives resulting in enhanced Office of Inspector General effectiveness.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (3 U.S.C. 102 note), and Public Law 95-138, \$5,500,000.

FEDERAL CITIZEN SERVICES FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses authorized by 40 U.S.C. 323 and 44 U.S.C. 3604; and for expenses author-

ized by law, not otherwise provided for, in support of interagency projects that enable the Federal Government to enhance its ability to conduct activities electronically, through the development and implementation of innovative uses of information technology; \$55,000,000, to be deposited into the Federal Citizen Services Fund: *Provided*, That the previous amount may be transferred to Federal agencies to carry out the purpose of the Federal Citizen Services Fund: *Provided further*, That the appropriations, revenues, reimbursements, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of Federal Citizen Services and other activities that enable the Federal Government to enhance its ability to conduct activities electronically in the aggregate amount not to exceed \$150,000,000: *Provided further*, That appropriations, revenues, reimbursements, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2024 in excess of such amount shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That, of the total amount appropriated, up to \$5,000,000 shall be available for support functions and full-time hires to support activities related to the Administration's requirements under title II of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-435): *Provided further*, That the transfer authorities provided herein shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

PRE-ELECTION PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For activities authorized by the Presidential Transition Act of 1963, as amended, not to exceed \$10,413,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025: *Provided*, That such amounts may be transferred to "Acquisition Services Fund" or "Federal Buildings Fund" to reimburse obligations incurred for the purposes provided herein in fiscal years 2023 and 2024: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading shall be in addition to any other amounts available for such purposes.

ASSET PROCEEDS AND SPACE MANAGEMENT FUND

For carrying out section 16(b) of the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (40 U.S.C. 1303 note), \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Working Capital Fund of the General Services Administration, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary costs incurred by the Administrator to modernize rulemaking systems and to provide support services for Federal rulemaking agencies.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 540. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 541. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2024 for Federal Buildings Fund activities may be transferred between such activities only to the extent necessary to meet program requirements: *Provided*, That any proposed transfers shall be approved in advance by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 542. Except as otherwise provided in this title, funds made available by this Act shall be used to transmit a fiscal year 2025 request for United States Courthouse construction only if the request: (1) meets the design guide standards for construction as

established and approved by the General Services Administration, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Office of Management and Budget; (2) reflects the priorities of the Judicial Conference of the United States as set out in its approved Courthouse Project Priorities plan; and (3) includes a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded.

SEC. 543. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to increase the amount of occupiable square feet, provide cleaning services, security enhancements, or any other service usually provided through the Federal Buildings Fund, to any agency that does not pay the rate per square foot assessment for space and services as determined by the General Services Administration in consideration of the Public Buildings Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-313).

SEC. 544. From funds made available under the heading "Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue", claims against the Government of less than \$250,000 arising from direct construction projects and acquisition of buildings may be liquidated from savings effected in other construction projects with prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 545. In any case in which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate adopt a resolution granting lease authority pursuant to a prospectus transmitted to Congress by the Administrator of the General Services Administration under 40 U.S.C. 3307, the Administrator shall ensure that the delineated area of procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus for all lease agreements, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to each of such committees and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate prior to exercising any lease authority provided in the resolution.

SEC. 546. With respect to projects funded under the heading "Federal Citizen Services Fund", the Administrator of General Services shall submit a spending plan and explanation for each project to be undertaken to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 547. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act for the General Services Administration or any other Federal agency may be obligated or expended for the leasing of facilities for temporary or permanent use by the United States Space Command for headquarters operations until the report required under subsection (b) is submitted.

(b) The Administrator of the General Services Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on all leased facilities associated with the United States Space Command headquarters.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For payment to the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation Trust Fund, established by section 10 of Public Law 93-642, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, and the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, direct procurement of survey printing, and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$47,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, and in addition not to exceed \$2,345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025, for administrative expenses to adjudicate retirement appeals to be transferred from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in amounts determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board.

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION
MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL TRUST FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payment to the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, pursuant to the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation Act (20 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.), \$1,800,000, to remain available for direct expenditure until expended, of which, notwithstanding sections 8 and 9 of such Act, up to \$1,000,000 shall be available to carry out the activities authorized by section 6(7) of Public Law 102-259 and section 817(a) of Public Law 106-568 (20 U.S.C. 5604(7)): *Provided*, That all current and previous amounts transferred to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior will remain available until expended for audits and investigations of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for annual independent financial audits of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-289): *Provided further*, That previous amounts transferred to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior may be transferred to the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation for annual independent financial audits pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-289).

ENVIRONMENTAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FUND
For payment to the Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund to carry out activities authorized in the Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act of 1998, \$3,296,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the National Archives and Records Administration and archived Federal records and related activities, as provided by law, and for expenses necessary for the review and declassification of documents, the activities of the Public Interest Declassification Board, the operations and maintenance of the electronic records archives, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning, \$427,250,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall remain available until expended for expenses necessary to enhance the Federal Government's ability to electronically preserve, manage, and store Government records.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, Public Law 110-409, 122 Stat. 4302-16 (2008), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$6,400,000.

REPAIRS AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of archives facilities, and museum exhibits, related equipment for public spaces, and to provide adequate storage for holdings, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION
GRANTS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for allocations and grants for historical publications and records as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 2504, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUND

For the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund program as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 9812, 9822, and 9910, \$3,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2024, for technical assistance to low-income designated credit unions.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Government Ethics pursuant to the chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, and the Representative Louise McIntosh Slaughter Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act of 2012, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$22,377,000.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where Voting Rights Act activities require an employee to remain overnight at his or her post of duty, \$164,934,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$1,167,805 may be made available for strengthening the capacity and capabilities of the acquisition workforce (as defined by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as amended (41 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.)), including the recruitment, hiring, training, and retention of such workforce and information technology in support of acquisition workforce effectiveness or for management solutions to improve acquisition management; and in addition \$174,714,000 for administrative expenses, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of OPM without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials, for the retirement and insurance programs: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this appropriation shall not affect the authority to

use applicable trust funds as provided by sections 8348(a)(1)(B), 8958(f)(2)(A), 8988(f)(2)(A), and 9004(f)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit of OPM established pursuant to Executive Order No. 9358 of July 1, 1943, or any successor unit of like purpose: *Provided further*, That the President's Commission on White House Fellows, established by Executive Order No. 11183 of October 3, 1964, may, during fiscal year 2024, accept donations of money, property, and personal services: *Provided further*, That such donations, including those from prior years, may be used for the development of publicity materials to provide information about the White House Fellows, except that no such donations shall be accepted for travel or reimbursement of travel expenses, or for the salaries of employees of such Commission: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 percent of amounts made available under this heading may be transferred to an information technology working capital fund established for purposes authorized by subtitle G of title X of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91; 40 U.S.C. 11301 note): *Provided further*, That the OPM Director shall notify, and receive approval from, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at least 15 days in advance of any transfer under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That amounts transferred to such a fund under such transfer authority from any organizational category of OPM shall not exceed 5 percent of each such organizational category's budget as identified in the report required by section 608 of this Act: *Provided further*, That amounts transferred to such a fund shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2027.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$5,150,000, and in addition, not to exceed \$28,083,000 for administrative expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other oversight of the Office of Personnel Management's retirement and insurance programs, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management, as determined by the Inspector General: *Provided*, That the Inspector General is authorized to rent conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Special Counsel, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, payment of fees and expenses for witnesses, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$31,904,000.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, as authorized by section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), \$13,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2025.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS REFORM BOARD
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Public Buildings Reform Board in carrying out the

Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-287), \$3,605,000, to remain available until expended.

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed \$3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$1,999,663,000, to remain available until expended; of which not less than \$20,050,000 shall be for the Office of Inspector General; of which not to exceed \$275,000 shall be available for a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions; and of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations and staffs to exchange views concerning securities matters, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance including: (1) incidental expenses such as meals; (2) travel and transportation; and (3) related lodging or subsistence; and of which not more than \$644,719,000 shall be for the Division of Enforcement.

In addition to the foregoing appropriation, for move, replication, and related costs associated with a replacement lease for the Commission's District of Columbia headquarters facilities, not to exceed \$25,243,000, to remain available until expended; and for move, replication, and related costs associated with a replacement lease for the Commission's Atlanta Office facilities, not to exceed \$14,415,000, to remain available until expended.

For purposes of calculating the fee rate under section 31(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(j)) for fiscal year 2024, all amounts appropriated under this heading shall be deemed to be the regular appropriation to the Commission for fiscal year 2024: *Provided*, That fees and charges authorized by section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,999,663,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of this account; not to exceed \$25,243,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for move, replication, and related costs under this heading associated with a replacement lease for the Commission's District of Columbia headquarters facilities; and not to exceed \$14,415,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for move, replication, and related costs under this heading associated with a replacement lease for the Commission's Atlanta Office facilities: *Provided further*, That the total amount appropriated under this heading from the general fund for fiscal year 2024 shall be reduced as such offsetting fees are received so as to result in a final total fiscal year 2024 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That if any amount of the appropriation for move, replication, and related costs associated with a replacement lease for the Commission's District of Columbia headquarters facilities or if any amount of the appropriation for move, replication, and related costs associated with a replacement lease for the Commission's Atlanta Regional Office facilities is subsequently de-obligated by the Commission, such amount that was derived from the general fund shall be returned to the general

fund, and such amounts that were derived from fees or assessments collected for such purpose shall be paid to each national securities exchange and national securities association, respectively, in proportion to any fees or assessments paid by such national securities exchange or national securities association under section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) in fiscal year 2024.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 550. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors" (87 Fed. Reg. 21334 (April 11, 2022)) or any substantially similar rule.

SEC. 551. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the rulemaking entitled "Open-End Fund Liquidity Risk Management Programs and Swing Pricing; Form N-PORT Reporting" (87 Fed. Reg. 77172 (December 16, 2022)).

SEC. 552. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the rulemaking entitled "Regulation Best Execution", "Order Competition Rule", and "Regulation NMS: Minimum Pricing Increments, Access Fees, and Transparency of Better Priced Order".

SEC. 553. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Commission to compel a private company to make a public offering under the Securities Act of 1933 by amending the "held of record" definition under section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

SEC. 554. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, implement, or enforce the rulemaking entitled "Safeguarding Advisory Client Assets" (88 Fed. Reg. 14672 (March 9, 2023)).

SEC. 555. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used, during the 270-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, to collect, or implement any program that would collect, retail investor personally identifiable information (in this section referred to as "PII") by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, the Consolidated Audit Trail, LLC, Customer Account Information System, or any other legal entity under Securities and Exchange Committee Rule 613.

(b) The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress, not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on analysis of—

(1) the privacy concerns, the constitutionality, and the current law in the Federal judicial circuits and the Supreme Court regarding the legality of the collection of retail investor PII by a regulator without any evidence of wrongdoing; and

(2) whether Congress has given the SEC the implicit or explicit statutory authority to create a national database that collects the PII of retail investors.

SEC. 556. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the rulemaking entitled "Amendments Regarding the Definition of "Exchange" and Alternative Trading Systems (ATSSs) That Trade U.S. Treasury and Agency Securities, National Market System (NMS) Stocks, and Other Securities".

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uni-

formed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101-4118 for civilian employees; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$31,300,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever the President deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by sections 1343 and 1344 of title 31, United States Code, and not to exceed \$3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$278,378,000, of which not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for examinations, reviews, and other lender oversight activities: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of publications developed by the Small Business Administration, and certain loan program activities, including fees authorized by section 5(b) of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, revenues received from all such activities shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, for carrying out these purposes without further appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Small Business Administration may accept gifts in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 and may co-sponsor activities, each in accordance with section 132(a) of division K of Public Law 108-447, during fiscal year 2024: *Provided further*, That \$6,100,000 shall be available for the Loan Modernization and Accounting System, to be available until September 30, 2024: *Provided further*, That \$20,500,000 shall be available for costs associated with the certification of small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans or service-disabled veterans under sections 36A and 36 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 6571-1; 657D), respectively, and section 862 of Public Law 116-283, to be available until September 30, 2024.

ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of programs supporting entrepreneurial and small business development, \$299,250,000, to remain available until September 30, 2024: *Provided*, That \$140,000,000 shall be available to fund grants for performance in fiscal year 2024 or fiscal year 2025 as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That \$41,000,000 shall be for marketing, management, and technical assistance under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)) by intermediaries that make microloans under the microloan program: *Provided further*, That \$20,000,000 shall be available for grants to States to carry out export programs that assist small business concerns authorized under section 22(l) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649(l)).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$32,020,000.

OFFICE OF ADVOCACY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Advocacy in carrying out the provisions of title II of Public Law 94-305 (15 U.S.C. 634a et seq.) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5

U.S.C. 601 et seq.), \$9,466,000, to remain available until expended.

**BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For the cost of direct loans, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2024 commitments to guarantee loans under section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and commitments for loans authorized under subparagraph (C) of section 502(7) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696(7)) shall not exceed, in the aggregate, \$12,500,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2024 commitments for general business loans authorized under paragraphs (1) through (35) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed \$32,500,000,000 for a combination of amortizing term loans and the aggregated maximum line of credit provided by revolving loans: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2024 commitments to guarantee loans for debentures under section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 shall not exceed \$5,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2024, guarantees of trust certificates authorized by section 5(g) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed a principal amount of \$15,000,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$163,000,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

**DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, \$178,000,000, to be available until expended, of which \$1,600,000 is for the Office of Inspector General of the Small Business Administration for audits and reviews of disaster loans and the disaster loan programs and shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for the Office of Inspector General; of which \$168,000,000 is for direct administrative expenses of loan making and servicing to carry out the direct loan program, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses; and of which \$8,400,000 is for indirect administrative expenses for the direct loan program, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses: *Provided*, That, of the funds provided under this heading, \$143,000,000 shall be for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)): *Provided further*, That the amount for major disasters under this heading is designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 560. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Small Business Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this paragraph shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 608 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure ex-

cept in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 561. Not to exceed 3 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act for the Small Business Administration under the headings “Salaries and Expenses” and “Business Loans Program Account” may be transferred to the Administration’s information technology system modernization and working capital fund (IT WCF), as authorized by section 1077(b)(1) of title X of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, for the purposes specified in section 1077(b)(3) of such Act, upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That amounts transferred to the IT WCF under this section shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2027.

SEC. 562. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out an enforcement action against a recipient of Federal assistance for a major disaster or emergency under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in any case in which such recipient—

(1) is unable to make monthly repayments for a duplication of benefits under section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155); and

(2) has not yet received Community Development Block Grant funds for which such recipient is eligible.

SEC. 563. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Small Business Administration to further fund or transfer funds to the Community Navigator Pilot Program established under section 5004 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (15 U.S.C. 9013).

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Small Business Administration to fund climate change initiatives.

**UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND**

For payment to the Postal Service Fund for revenue forgone on free and reduced rate mail, pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, \$35,424,000: *Provided*, That mail for overseas voting and mail for the blind shall continue to be free: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to implement any rule, regulation, or policy of charging any officer or employee of any State or local child support enforcement agency, or any individual participating in a State or local program of child support enforcement, a fee for information requested or provided concerning an address of a postal customer: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to consolidate or close small rural and other small post offices: *Provided further*, That the Postal Service may not destroy, and shall continue to offer for sale, any copies of the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp, as authorized under the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-241).

**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$274,467,000, to be derived by transfer from the Postal Service Fund and expended as authorized by section 603(b)(3) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435).

**UNITED STATES TAX COURT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses, including contract reporting and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$46,375,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available under 26 U.S.C. 7475 shall be transferred and added to any amounts available under 26 U.S.C. 7473, to remain available until expended, for the operation and maintenance of the United States Tax Court: *Provided further*, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

**TITLE VI
GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT
(INCLUDING RESCISSON OF FUNDS)**

SEC. 601. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, except for transfers made pursuant to the authority in section 3173(d) of title 40, United States Code, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 605. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

SEC. 606. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 607. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 608. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2024, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates a new program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress; (4) proposes to use

funds directed for a specific activity by the Committee on Appropriations of either the House of Representatives or the Senate for a different purpose; (5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; (6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) creates or reorganizes offices, programs, or activities unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That prior to any significant reorganization, restructuring, relocation, or closing of offices, programs, or activities, each agency or entity funded in this Act shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That at a minimum the report shall include: (1) a table for each appropriation, detailing both full-time employee equivalents and budget authority, with separate columns to display the prior year enacted level, the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level; (2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation and its respective prior year enacted level by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in this Act, in the accompanying report, or in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation, whichever is more detailed, and which shall apply to all items for which a dollar amount is specified and to all programs for which new budget authority is provided, as well as to discretionary grants and discretionary grant allocations; and (3) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 609. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2024 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2024 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2025, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 610. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of the President to request—

(1) any official background investigation report on any individual from the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

(2) a determination with respect to the treatment of an organization as described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code from the Department of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) in the case of an official background investigation report, if such individual has given express written consent for such request not more than 6 months prior to the date of such request and during the same presidential administration; or

(2) if such request is required due to extraordinary circumstances involving national security.

SEC. 611. The cost accounting standards promulgated under chapter 15 of title 41, United States Code shall not apply with respect to a contract under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 612. For the purpose of resolving litigation and implementing any settlement agreements regarding the nonforeign area cost-of-living allowance program, the Office of Personnel Management may accept and utilize (without regard to any restriction on unanticipated travel expenses imposed in an appropriations Act) funds made available to the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to court approval.

SEC. 613. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefits program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 614. The provision of section 613 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 615. In order to promote Government access to commercial information technology, the restriction on purchasing non-domestic articles, materials, and supplies set forth in chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly known as the Buy American Act), shall not apply to the acquisition by the Federal Government of information technology (as defined in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code), that is a commercial item (as defined in section 103 of title 41, United States Code).

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding section 1353 of title 31, United States Code, no officer or employee of any regulatory agency or commission funded by this Act may accept on behalf of that agency, nor may such agency or commission accept, payment or reimbursement from a non-Federal entity for travel, subsistence, or related expenses for the purpose of enabling an officer or employee to attend and participate in any meeting or similar function relating to the official duties of the officer or employee when the entity offering payment or reimbursement is a person or entity subject to regulation by such agency or commission, or represents a person or entity subject to regulation by such agency or commission, unless the person or entity is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

SEC. 617. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an Executive agency covered by this Act otherwise authorized to enter into contracts for either leases or the construction or alteration of real property for office, meeting, storage, or other space must consult with the General Services Administration before issuing a solicitation for offers of new leases or construction contracts, and in the case of succeeding leases, before entering into negotiations with the current lessor.

(2) Any such agency with authority to enter into an emergency lease may do so during any period declared by the President to require emergency leasing authority with respect to such agency.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term “Executive agency covered by this Act” means any Executive agency provided funds by this Act, but does not include the General Services Administration or the United States Postal Service.

SEC. 618. (a) There are appropriated for the following activities the amounts required under current law:

(1) Compensation of the President (3 U.S.C. 102).

(2) Payments to—

(A) the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund (28 U.S.C. 377(o));

(B) the Judicial Survivors' Annuities Fund (28 U.S.C. 376(c)); and

(C) the United States Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement Fund (28 U.S.C. 1781).

(3) Payment of Government contributions—

(A) with respect to the health benefits of retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849); and

(B) with respect to the life insurance benefits for employees retiring after December 31, 1989 (5 U.S.C. ch. 87).

(4) Payment to finance the unfunded liability of new and increased annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (5 U.S.C. 8348).

(5) Payment of annuities authorized to be paid from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund by statutory provisions other than subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) Nothing in this section may be construed to exempt any amount appropriated by this section from any otherwise applicable limitation on the use of funds contained in this Act.

SEC. 619. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Trade Commission to complete the draft report entitled “*Interagency Working Group on Food Marketed to Children: Preliminary Proposed Nutrition Principles to Guide Industry Self-Regulatory Efforts*” unless the Interagency Working Group on Food Marketed to Children complies with Executive Order No. 13563.

SEC. 620. (a) The head of each executive branch agency funded by this Act shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology.

(b) Amounts appropriated for any executive branch agency funded by this Act that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

SEC. 621. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of chapter 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 622. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by a governmental entity to require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service to the public or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with the provider (as such terms are defined in sections 2510 and 2711 of title 18, United States Code) in a manner that violates the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 623. No funds provided in this Act shall be used to deny an Inspector General funded under this Act timely access to any records, documents, or other materials available to the department or agency over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under chapter 4 of title 5, United States Code, or to prevent or impede that Inspector General's access to such records, documents, or other materials, under any provision of law, except a provision of law that expressly

refers to the Inspector General and expressly limits the Inspector General's right of access. A department or agency covered by this section shall provide its Inspector General with access to all such records, documents, and other materials in a timely manner. Each Inspector General shall ensure compliance with statutory limitations on disclosure relevant to the information provided by the establishment over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the chapter 4 of title 5, United States Code. Each Inspector General covered by this section shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within five calendar days any failures to comply with this requirement.

SEC. 624. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to modify, amend, or change the rules or regulations of the Commission for universal service high-cost support for competitive eligible telecommunications carriers in a way that is inconsistent with paragraph (e)(5) or (e)(6) of section 54.307 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on July 15, 2015: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the Commission from considering, developing, or adopting other support mechanisms as an alternative to Mobility Fund Phase II: *Provided further*, That any such alternative mechanism shall maintain existing high-cost support to competitive eligible telecommunications carriers until support under such mechanism commences.

SEC. 625. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, Tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, adjudication activities, or other law enforcement- or victim assistance-related activity.

SEC. 626. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractors whose performance has been judged to be below satisfactory, behind schedule, over budget, or has failed to meet the basic requirements of a contract, unless the Agency determines that any such deviations are due to unforeseeable events, government-driven scope changes, or are not significant within the overall scope of the project and/or program and unless such awards or incentive fees are consistent with section 16.401(e)(2) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

SEC. 627. (a) None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay for travel and conference activities that result in a total cost to an Executive branch department, agency, board, or commission funded by this Act of more than \$500,000 at any single conference unless the agency or entity determines that such attendance is in the national interest and advance notice is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that includes the basis of that determination.

(b) None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay for the travel to or attendance of more than 50 employees, who are stationed in the United States, at any single conference occurring outside the United States unless the agency or entity determines that such attendance is in the national interest and advance notice is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that includes the basis of that determination.

SEC. 628. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for first-class or business-class travel by the employees of executive branch agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.125 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 629. In addition to any amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for expenses related to enhancements to www.oversight.gov, \$850,000, to remain available until expended, shall be provided for an additional amount for such purpose to the Inspectors General Council Fund established pursuant to section 11(c)(3)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978: *Provided*, That these amounts shall be in addition to any amounts or any authority available to the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency under section 424 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 630. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated on contracts in excess of \$5,000 for public relations, as that term is defined in Office and Management and Budget Circular A-87 (revised May 10, 2004), unless advance notice of such an obligation is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 631. Federal agencies funded under this Act shall clearly state within the text, audio, or video used for advertising or educational purposes, including emails or Internet postings, that the communication is printed, published, or produced and disseminated at U.S. taxpayer expense. The funds used by a Federal agency to carry out this requirement shall be derived from amounts made available to the agency for advertising or other communications regarding the programs and activities of the agency.

SEC. 632. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds included in this Act, shall clearly state—

(1) the percentage of the total costs of the program or project which will be financed with Federal money;

(2) the dollar amount of Federal funds for the project or program; and

(3) percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed by non-governmental sources.

SEC. 633. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, issue, or implement any rule, regulation, or order regarding the disclosure of political contributions, contributions to tax exempt organizations, or dues paid to trade associations.

SEC. 634. Not later than 45 days after the last day of each quarter, each agency funded in this Act shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a quarterly budget report that includes total obligations of the Agency for that quarter for each appropriation, by the source year of the appropriation.

SEC. 635. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure electric vehicles, electric vehicle batteries, electric vehicle charging stations or infrastructure.

SEC. 636. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 205 of Executive Order No. 14008 (relating to tackling climate crisis at home and abroad) until a stable supply of domestic-mined critical minerals can be achieved.

SEC. 637. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any program, project, or activity that promotes or advances Critical Race Theory or any concept associated with Critical Race Theory.

SEC. 638. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to implement, administer, apply, enforce, or carry out the Equity Action Plans of the Department of Treasury, the Federal Communications Commission, the General Services Administration, the Office of Personnel Management or any other Federal agency diversity, equity, or inclusion initiative, as well as Executive Order No. 13985 of January 20, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 7009, relating to advancing racial equity and support for underserved communities through the Federal Government), Executive Order No. 14035 of June 21, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 34596, relating to diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility in the Federal workforce), or Executive Order No. 14091 of February 16, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 10825, relating to further advancing racial equity and support for underserved communities through the Federal Government).

SEC. 639. None of the funds made available by this Act may be made available to support, directly or indirectly, the Wuhan Institute of Virology, or any laboratory owned or controlled by the governments of the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Cuba, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela under the regime of Nicolás Maduro Moros, or any other country determined by the Secretary of State to be a foreign adversary.

SEC. 640. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the requirements in section 316(b)(4)(D) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30118(b)(4)(D)) that the solicitation of contributions from member corporations stockholders and executive or administrative personnel, and the families of such stockholders or personnel, by trade associations must be separately and specifically approved by the member corporation involved prior to such solicitation, and that such member corporation does not approve any such solicitation by more than one such trade association in any calendar year.

SEC. 641. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7 of title 1, United States Code, section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law, none of the funds provided by this Act or any other Act shall be used in whole or in part to take any discriminatory action against a person, wholly or partially, on the basis that such person speaks, or acts, in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief, or moral conviction, that marriage is, or should be recognized as, a union of one man and one woman.

(b) DISCRIMINATORY ACTION DEFINED.—As used in subsection (a), a discriminatory action means any action taken by the Federal Government to—

(1) alter in any way the Federal tax treatment of, or cause any tax, penalty, or payment to be assessed against, or deny, delay, or revoke an exemption from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of, any person referred to in subsection (a);

(2) disallow a deduction for Federal tax purposes of any charitable contribution made to or by such person;

(3) withhold, reduce the amount or funding for, exclude, terminate, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, any Federal grant, contract, subcontract, cooperative agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, employment, or other similar position or status from or to such person;

(4) withhold, reduce, exclude, terminate, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, any entitlement or benefit under a Federal benefit program, including admission to, equal treatment in, or eligibility for a degree from an educational program, from or to such person; or

(c) ACCREDITATION; LICENSURE; CERTIFICATION.—The Federal Government shall consider accredited, licensed, or certified for purposes of Federal law any person that would be accredited, licensed, or certified, respectively, for such purposes but for a determination against such person wholly or partially on the basis that the person speaks, or acts, in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief or moral conviction described in subsection (a).

SEC. 642. Of the unobligated balances available in Public Law 117-169, \$6,065,000,000 available under section 10301(1)(A)(ii); \$4,101,000,000 available under section 10301(1)(A)(iii); and \$3,210,000,000 available under sections 60502, 60503, and 60504 as of the date of the enactment of this Act are rescinded.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS—GOVERNMENT-WIDE

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this or any other Act for fiscal year 2024 shall obligate or expend any such funds, unless such department, agency, or instrumentality has in place, and will continue to administer in good faith, a written policy designed to ensure that all of its workplaces are free from the illegal use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances (as defined in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)) by the officers and employees of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

SEC. 702. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 1343(c) of title 31, United States Code, for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses, ambulances, law enforcement vehicles, protective vehicles, and undercover surveillance vehicles), is hereby fixed at \$30,126 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be \$31,266: *Provided*, That these limits may be exceeded by not to exceed \$7,775 for police-type vehicles: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section may not be exceeded by more than 5 percent for electric or hybrid vehicles purchased for demonstration under the provisions of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section may be exceeded by the incremental cost of clean alternative fuels vehicles acquired pursuant to Public Law 101-549 over the cost of comparable conventionally fueled vehicles: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section shall not apply to any vehicle that is a commercial item and which operates on alternative fuel, including but not limited to electric, plug-in hybrid electric, and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles.

SEC. 703. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year available for expenses of travel, or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5922-5924.

SEC. 704. Unless otherwise specified in law during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other

Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless such person: (1) is a citizen of the United States; (2) is a person who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence and is seeking citizenship as outlined in 8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(3)(B); (3) is a person who is admitted as a refugee under 8 U.S.C. 1157 or is granted asylum under 8 U.S.C. 1158 and has filed a declaration of intention to become a lawful permanent resident and then a citizen when eligible; or (4) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, affidavits signed by any such person shall be considered *prima facie* evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his or her status are being complied with: *Provided further*, That for purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) such affidavits shall be submitted prior to employment and updated thereafter as necessary: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction, shall be fined no more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to any person who is an officer or employee of the Government of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, or to international broadcasters employed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed 60 days) as a result of emergencies: *Provided further*, That this section does not apply to the employment as Wildland firefighters for not more than 120 days of nonresident aliens employed by the Department of the Interior or the USDA Forest Service pursuant to an agreement with another country.

SEC. 705. Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for payment to the General Services Administration for charges for space and services and those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 216), or other applicable law.

SEC. 706. In addition to funds provided in this or any other Act, all Federal agencies are authorized to receive and use funds resulting from the sale of materials, including Federal records disposed of pursuant to a records schedule recovered through recycling or waste prevention programs. Such funds shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

(1) Acquisition, waste reduction and prevention, and recycling programs as described in Executive Order No. 14057 (December 8, 2021), including any such programs adopted prior to the effective date of the Executive Order.

(2) Other Federal agency environmental management programs, including, but not limited to, the development and implementation of hazardous waste management and pollution prevention programs.

(3) Other employee programs as authorized by law or as deemed appropriate by the head of the Federal agency.

SEC. 707. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109; and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 708. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for interagency financing of boards (except Federal Executive Boards), commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups (whether or not they are interagency entities) which do not have a prior and specific statutory approval to receive financial support from more than one agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 709. None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this or any other Act shall be used to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a joint resolution duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

SEC. 710. During the period in which the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or civilian employee of the Federal Government appointed by the President of the United States, holds office, no funds may be obligated or expended in excess of \$5,000 to furnish or redecorate the office of such department head, agency head, officer, or employee, or to purchase furniture or make improvements for any such office, unless advance notice of such furnishing or redecoration is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. For the purposes of this section, the term “office” shall include the entire suite of offices assigned to the individual, as well as any other space used primarily by the individual or the use of which is directly controlled by the individual.

SEC. 711. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunications initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order No. 13618 (July 6, 2012).

SEC. 712. (a) None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government to pay the salaries or expenses of any individual appointed to a position of a confidential or policy-determining character that is excepted from the competitive service under section 3302 of title 5, United States Code, (pursuant to schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations) unless the head of the applicable department, agency, or other instrumentality employing such schedule C individual certifies to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management that the schedule C position occupied by the individual was not created solely or primarily in order to detail the individual to the White House.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to Federal employees or members of the armed forces detailed to or from an element of the intelligence community (as that

term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 713. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Government, who—

(1) prohibits or prevents, or attempts or threatens to prohibit or prevent, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such other officer or employee or pertaining to the department or agency of such other officer or employee in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such other officer or employee or in response to the request or inquiry of such Member, committee, or subcommittee;

(2) removes, suspends from duty without pay, demotes, reduces in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance or efficiency rating, denies promotion to, relocates, reassigned, transfers, disciplines, or discriminates in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government, or attempts or threatens to commit any of the foregoing actions with respect to such other officer or employee, by reason of any communication or contact of such other officer or employee with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress as described in paragraph (1);

(3) unjustifiably refuses to comply with a duly issued and valid congressional subpoena.

SEC. 714. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or “new age” belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants’ personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 715. No part of any funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 716. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used by an agency to provide a Federal employee’s home address to any labor organization except when the employee has authorized such disclosure or when such disclosure has been ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 717. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to provide any non-public information such as mailing, telephone, or electronic mailing lists to any person or any organization outside of the Federal Government without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 718. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used directly or indirectly, including by private contractor, for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not herefore authorized by Congress.

SEC. 719. (a) In this section, the term “agency”—

(1) means an Executive agency, as defined under 5 U.S.C. 105;

(2) includes a military department, as defined under section 102 of such title; and

(3) includes the United States Postal Service.

(b) Unless authorized in accordance with law or regulations to use such time for other purposes, an employee of an agency shall use official time in an honest effort to perform official duties. An employee not under a leave system, including a Presidential appointee exempted under 5 U.S.C. 6301(2), has an obligation to expend an honest effort and a reasonable proportion of such employee’s time in the performance of official duties.

SEC. 720. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act to any department or agency, which is a member of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB), shall be available to finance an appropriate share of FASAB administrative costs.

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, the head of each Executive department and agency is hereby authorized to transfer to or reimburse “General Services Administration, Government-wide Policy” with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act, including rebates from charge card and other contracts: *Provided*, That these funds shall be administered by the Administrator of General Services to support Government-wide and other multi-agency financial, information technology, procurement, and other management innovations, initiatives, and activities, including improving coordination and reducing duplication, as approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the appropriate inter-agency and multi-agency groups designated by the Director (including the President’s Management Council for overall management improvement initiatives, the Chief Financial Officers Council for financial management initiatives, the Chief Information Officers Council for information technology initiatives, the Chief Human Capital Officers Council for human capital initiatives, the Chief Acquisition Officers Council for procurement initiatives, and the Performance Improvement Council for performance improvement initiatives): *Provided further*, That the total funds transferred or reimbursed shall not exceed \$15,000,000 to improve coordination, reduce duplication, and for other activities related to Federal Government Priority Goals established by 31 U.S.C. 1120, and not to exceed \$17,000,000 for Government-wide innovations, initiatives, and activities: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred to or for reimbursement of “General Services Administration, Government-Wide Policy” during fiscal year 2024 shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2025: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after enactment of this

Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives a detailed spend plan for the funds to be transferred or reimbursed: *Provided further*, That the spend plan shall, at a minimum, include: (I) the amounts currently in the funds authorized under this section and the estimate of amounts to be transferred or reimbursed in fiscal year 2024; (ii) a detailed breakdown of the purposes for all funds estimated to be transferred or reimbursed pursuant to this section (including total number of personnel and costs for all staff whose salaries are provided for by this section); (iii) where applicable, a description of the funds intended for use by or for the benefit of each executive council; and (iv) where applicable, a description of the funds intended for use by or for the implementation of specific laws passed by Congress: *Provided further*, That no transfers or reimbursements may be made pursuant to this section until 15 days following notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 722. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a woman may breastfeed her child at any location in a Federal building or on Federal property, if the woman and her child are otherwise authorized to be present at the location.

SEC. 723. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act shall be available for the inter-agency funding of specific projects, workshops, studies, and similar efforts to carry out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Council (authorized by Executive Order No. 12881), which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities: *Provided*, That the Office of Management and Budget shall provide a report describing the budget of and resources connected with the National Science and Technology Council to the Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 90 days after enactment of this Act.

SEC. 724. Any request for proposals, solicitation, grant application, form, notification, press release, or other publications involving the distribution of Federal funds shall comply with any relevant requirements in part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations: *Provided*, That this section shall apply to direct payments, formula funds, and grants received by a State receiving Federal funds.

SEC. 725. (a) PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY MONITORING OF INDIVIDUALS’ INTERNET USE.—None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by any Federal agency—

(1) to collect, review, or create any aggregation of data, derived from any means, that includes any personally identifiable information relating to an individual’s access to or use of any Federal Government Internet site of the agency; or

(2) to enter into any agreement with a third party (including another government agency) to collect, review, or obtain any aggregation of data, derived from any means, that includes any personally identifiable information relating to an individual’s access to or use of any nongovernmental Internet site.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitations established in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any record of aggregate data that does not identify particular persons;

(2) any voluntary submission of personally identifiable information;

(3) any action taken for law enforcement, regulatory, or supervisory purposes, in accordance with applicable law; or

(4) any action described in subsection (a)(1) that is a system security action taken by the operator of an Internet site and is necessarily incident to providing the Internet site services or to protecting the rights or property of the provider of the Internet site.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term “regulatory” means agency actions to implement, interpret or enforce authorities provided in law.

(2) The term “supervisory” means examinations of the agency’s supervised institutions, including assessing safety and soundness, overall financial condition, management practices and policies and compliance with applicable standards as provided in law.

SEC. 726. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enter into or renew a contract which includes a provision providing prescription drug coverage, except where the contract also includes a provision for contraceptive coverage.

(b) Nothing in this section shall apply to a contract with—

(1) any of the following religious plans:

(A) Personal Care’s HMO; and

(B) OSF HealthPlans, Inc.; and

(2) any existing or future plan, if the carrier for the plan objects to such coverage on the basis of religious beliefs.

(c) In implementing this section, any plan that enters into or renews a contract under this section may not subject any individual to discrimination on the basis that the individual refuses to prescribe or otherwise provide for contraceptives because such activities would be contrary to the individual’s religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require coverage of abortion or abortion-related services.

SEC. 727. The United States is committed to ensuring the health of its Olympic, Pan American, and Paralympic athletes, and supports the strict adherence to anti-doping in sport through testing, adjudication, education, and research as performed by nationally recognized oversight authorities.

SEC. 728. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for official travel to Federal departments and agencies may be used by such departments and agencies, if consistent with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-126 regarding official travel for Government personnel, to participate in the fractional aircraft ownership pilot program.

SEC. 729. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this or any other appropriations Act may be used to implement or enforce restrictions or limitations on the Coast Guard Congressional Fellowship Program, or to implement the proposed regulations of the Office of Personnel Management to add sections 300.311 through 300.316 to part 300 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, published in the Federal Register, volume 68, number 174, on September 9, 2003 (relating to the detail of executive branch employees to the legislative branch).

SEC. 730. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no executive branch agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, except

that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training which cannot be accommodated in existing Centers facilities.

SEC. 731. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States, unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 732. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 552a of title 5, United States Code (popularly known as the Privacy Act), and regulations implementing that section.

SEC. 733. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used for any Federal Government contract with any foreign incorporated entity which is treated as an inverted domestic corporation under section 835(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(b)) or any subsidiary of such an entity.

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Secretary shall waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such Secretary if the Secretary determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Any Secretary issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall report such issuance to Congress.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to any Federal Government contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act, or to any task order issued pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 734. During fiscal year 2024, for each employee who—

(1) retires under section 8336(d)(2) or 8414(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) retires under any other provision of subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of such title 5 and receives a payment as an incentive to separate, the separating agency shall remit to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to the Office of Personnel Management’s average unit cost of processing a retirement claim for the preceding fiscal year. Such amounts shall be available until expended to the Office of Personnel Management and shall be deemed to be an administrative expense under section 8348(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 735. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to recommend or require any entity submitting an offer for a Federal contract to disclose any of the following information as a condition of submitting the offer:

(1) Any payment consisting of a contribution, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement for an electioneering communication that is made by the entity, its officers or directors, or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries to a candidate for election for Federal office or to a political committee, or that is otherwise made with respect to any election for Federal office.

(2) Any disbursement of funds (other than a payment described in paragraph (1)) made by the entity, its officers or directors, or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries to any person with the intent or the reasonable expectation that the person will use the funds to make a payment described in paragraph (1).

(b) In this section, each of the terms “contribution”, “expenditure”, “independent ex-

penditure”, “electioneering communication”, “candidate”, “election”, and “Federal office” has the meaning given such term in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.).

SEC. 736. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal Government, including the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress (including a Delegate or a Resident Commissioner to Congress), the head of an executive branch agency (as defined in section 133 of title 41, United States Code), or the head of an office of the legislative branch.

SEC. 737. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, no part of any of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2024, by this or any other Act, may be used to pay any prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code—

(A) during the period from the date of expiration of the limitation imposed by the comparable section for the previous fiscal years until the normal effective date of the applicable wage survey adjustment that is to take effect in fiscal year 2024, in an amount that exceeds the rate payable for the applicable grade and step of the applicable wage schedule in accordance with such section; and

(B) during the period consisting of the remainder of fiscal year 2024, in an amount that exceeds, as a result of a wage survey adjustment, the rate payable under subparagraph (A) by more than the sum of—

(i) the percentage adjustment taking effect in fiscal year 2024 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule; and

(ii) the difference between the overall average percentage of the locality-based comparability payments taking effect in fiscal year 2024 under section 5304 of such title (whether by adjustment or otherwise), and the overall average percentage of such payments which was effective in the previous fiscal year under such section.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no prevailing rate employee described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, and no employee covered by section 5348 of such title, may be paid during the periods for which paragraph (1) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under paragraph (1) were paragraph (1) applicable to such employee.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the rates payable to an employee who is covered by this subsection and who is paid from a schedule not in existence on September 30, 2023, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates of premium pay for employees subject to this subsection may not be changed from the rates in effect on September 30, 2023, except to the extent determined by the Office of Personnel Management to be consistent with the purpose of this subsection.

(5) This subsection shall apply with respect to pay for service performed after September 30, 2023.

(6) For the purpose of administering any provision of law (including any rule or regulation that provides premium pay, retirement, life insurance, or any other employee benefit) that requires any deduction or contribution, or that imposes any requirement or limitation on the basis of a rate of salary or basic pay, the rate of salary or basic pay payable after the application of this subsection shall be treated as the rate of salary or basic pay.

(7) Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to permit or require the payment to any employee covered by this subsection at a rate in excess of the rate that would be payable were this subsection not in effect.

(8) The Office of Personnel Management may provide for exceptions to the limitations imposed by this subsection if the Office determines that such exceptions are necessary to ensure the recruitment or retention of qualified employees.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the adjustment in rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems that take place in fiscal year 2024 under sections 5344 and 5348 of title 5, United States Code, shall be—

(1) not less than the percentage received by employees in the same location whose rates of basic pay are adjusted pursuant to the statutory pay systems under sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided*, That prevailing rate employees at locations where there are no employees whose pay is increased pursuant to sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code, and prevailing rate employees described in section 5343(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to be located in the pay locality designated as “Rest of United States” pursuant to section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of this subsection; and

(2) effective as of the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning after September 30, 2023.

SEC. 738. (a) The head of any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act shall submit annual reports to the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, regarding the costs and contracting procedures related to each conference held by any such department, agency, board, commission, or office during fiscal year 2024 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than \$100,000.

(b) Each report submitted shall include, for each conference described in subsection (a) held during the applicable period—

(1) a description of its purpose;

(2) the number of participants attending;

(3) a detailed statement of the costs to the United States Government, including—

(A) the cost of any food or beverages;

(B) the cost of any audio-visual services;

(C) the cost of employee or contractor travel to and from the conference; and

(D) a discussion of the methodology used to determine which costs relate to the conference; and

(4) a description of the contracting procedures used including—

(A) whether contracts were awarded on a competitive basis; and

(B) a discussion of any cost comparison conducted by the departmental component or office in evaluating potential contractors for the conference.

(c) Within 15 days after the end of a quarter, the head of any such department, agency, board, commission, or office shall notify the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, of the date, location, and number of employees attending a conference held by any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act during fiscal year 2024 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than \$20,000.

(d) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this or any other appropriations Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a conference described in subsection (c) that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded,

such as a conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(e) None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used for travel and conference activities that are not in compliance with Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M-12-12 dated May 11, 2012 or any subsequent revisions to that memorandum.

SEC. 739. None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used to increase, eliminate, or reduce funding for a program, project, or activity as proposed in the President’s budget request for a fiscal year until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming or transfer provisions of this or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 740. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or apply the rule entitled “Competitive Area” published by the Office of Personnel Management in the Federal Register on April 15, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 20180 et seq.).

SEC. 741. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to begin or announce a study or public-private competition regarding the conversion to contractor performance of any function performed by Federal employees pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 or any other administrative regulation, directive, or policy.

SEC. 742. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be available for a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with an entity that requires employees or contractors of such entity seeking to report fraud, waste, or abuse to sign internal confidentiality agreements or statements prohibiting or otherwise restricting such employees or contractors from lawfully reporting such waste, fraud, or abuse to a designated investigative or law enforcement representative of a Federal department or agency authorized to receive such information.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not contravene requirements applicable to Standard Form 312, Form 4414, or any other form issued by a Federal department or agency governing the nondisclosure of classified information.

SEC. 743. (a) No funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce the agreements in Standard Forms 312 and 4414 of the Government or any other nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement if such policy, form, or agreement does not contain the following provisions: “These provisions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights, or liabilities created by existing statute or Executive order relating to (1) classified information,

(2) communications to Congress, (3) the reporting to an Inspector General or the Office of Special Counsel of a violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or (4) any other whistleblower protection. The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by controlling Executive Orders and statutory provisions are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling.”: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the preceding provision of this section, a nondisclosure policy form or agreement that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an em-

ployee or officer of the United States Government, may contain provisions appropriate to the particular activity for which such document is to be used. Such form or agreement shall, at a minimum, require that the person will not disclose any classified information received in the course of such activity unless specifically authorized to do so by the United States Government. Such nondisclosure forms shall also make it clear that they do not bar disclosures to Congress, or to an authorized official of an executive agency or the Department of Justice, that are essential to reporting a substantial violation of law.

(b) A nondisclosure agreement may continue to be implemented and enforced notwithstanding subsection (a) if it complies with the requirements for such agreement that were in effect when the agreement was entered into.

(c) No funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce any agreement entered into during fiscal year 2024 which does not contain substantially similar language to that required in subsection (a).

SEC. 744. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless a Federal agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 745. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless a Federal agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 746. (a) Notwithstanding any official rate adjusted under section 104 of title 3, United States Code, the rate payable to the Vice President during calendar year 2024 shall be the rate payable to the Vice President on December 31, 2023, by operation of section 747 of division E of Public Law 117-328.

(b) Notwithstanding any official rate adjusted under section 5318 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the payable rate during calendar year 2024 for an employee serving in an Executive Schedule position, or in a position for which the rate of pay is fixed by statute at an Executive Schedule rate, shall be the rate payable for the applicable Executive Schedule level on December 31, 2023, by operation of section 747 of division E of Public Law 117-328. Such an employee may not receive a rate increase during calendar year 2024, except as provided in subsection (i).

(c) Notwithstanding section 401 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-465) or any other provision of law, a chief of mission or ambassador at large is subject to subsection (b) in the same manner as other employees who are paid at an Executive Schedule rate.

(d)(1) This subsection applies to—

(A) a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service paid a rate of basic pay at or above the official rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule; or

(B) a limited term appointee or limited emergency appointee in the Senior Executive Service serving under a political appointment and paid a rate of basic pay at or above the official rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

(2) Notwithstanding sections 5382 and 5383 of title 5, United States Code, an employee described in paragraph (1) may not receive a pay rate increase during calendar year 2024, except as provided in subsection (i).

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any employee paid a rate of basic pay (including any locality based payments under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, or similar authority) at or above the official rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule who serves under a political appointment may not receive a pay rate increase during calendar year 2024, except as provided in subsection (i). This subsection does not apply to employees in the General Schedule pay system or the Foreign Service pay system, to employees appointed under section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, or to employees in another pay system whose position would be classified at GS-15 or below if chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, applied to them.

(f) Nothing in subsections (b) through (e) shall prevent employees who do not serve under a political appointment from receiving pay increases as otherwise provided under applicable law.

(g) This section does not apply to an individual who makes an election to retain Senior Executive Service basic pay under section 3392(c) of title 5, United States Code, for such time as that election is in effect.

(h) This section does not apply to an individual who makes an election to retain Senior Foreign Service pay entitlements under section 302(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-465) for such time as that election is in effect.

(i) Notwithstanding subsections (b) through (e), an employee in a covered position may receive a pay rate increase upon an authorized movement to a different covered position only if that new position has higher-level duties and a pre-established level or range of pay higher than the level or range for the position held immediately before the movement. Any such increase must be based on the rates of pay and applicable limitations on payable rates of pay in effect on December 31, 2023, by operation of section 747 of division E of Public Law 117-328.

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for an individual who is newly appointed to a covered position during the period of time subject to this section, the initial pay rate shall be based on the rates of pay and applicable limitations on payable rates of pay in effect on December 31, 2023, by operation of section 747 of division E of Public Law 117-328.

(k) If an employee affected by this section is subject to a biweekly pay period that begins in calendar year 2024 but ends in calendar year 2025, the bar on the employee's receipt of pay rate increases shall apply through the end of that pay period.

(l) For the purpose of this section, the term "covered position" means a position occupied by an employee whose pay is restricted under this section.

(m) This section takes effect on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2024.

SEC. 747. In the event of a violation of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the President or the head of the relevant department

or agency, as the case may be, shall report immediately to the Congress all relevant facts and a statement of actions taken: *Provided*, That a copy of each report shall also be transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General on the same date the report is transmitted to the Congress.

SEC. 748. (a) Each department or agency of the executive branch of the United States Government shall notify the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate and any other appropriate congressional committees if—

(1) an apportionment is not made in the required time period provided in section 1513(b) of title 31, United States Code;

(2) an approved apportionment received by the department or agency conditions the availability of an appropriation on further action; or

(3) an approved apportionment received by the department or agency may hinder the prudent obligation of such appropriation or the execution of a program, project, or activity by such department or agency.

(b) Any notification submitted to a congressional committee pursuant to this section shall contain information identifying the bureau, account name, appropriation name, and Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account.

SEC. 749. Notwithstanding section 1346 of title 31, United States Code, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available by this or any other Act to any Federal agency may be used by that Federal agency for interagency funding for coordination with, participation in, or recommendations involving, activities of the U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command, the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs and the National Institutes of Health research programs.

SEC. 750. (a)(1) Not later than 100 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (in this section referred to as the "Director"), in coordination with the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board and the Administrator of General Services (in this section referred to as the "Administrator"), shall disseminate amended or updated criteria and instructions to any Federal department or agency (in this section referred to as an "agency") covered by section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d) for the evaluation required pursuant to paragraph (3)(B).

(2) Such criteria and instructions shall—

(A) include, at minimum, requirements that information technologies and digital services must—

(i) conform to the technical standards referenced in subsection (a)(2)(A) of such section 508, as determined by appropriate conformance testing; and

(ii) be accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities as determined from consultation with individuals with disabilities, including those with visual, auditory, tactile, and cognitive disabilities, or members of any disability organization; and

(B) provide guidance to agencies regarding the types and format of data and information to be submitted to the Director and the Administrator pursuant to paragraph (3), including how to submit such data and information, the metrics by which compliance will be assessed in the reports required in subsection (b), and any other directions necessary for agencies to demonstrate compliance with accessibility standards for electronic and information technology procured and in use within an agency, as required by such section 508.

(3) Not later than 225 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall—

(A) evaluate the extent to which the electronic and information technology of the agency are accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities described in subsection (a)(1) of such section 508 compared to the access to and use of the technology and services by individuals described in such section who are not individuals with disabilities;

(B) evaluate the electronic and information technology of the agency in accordance with the criteria and instructions provided in paragraph (1); and

(C) submit a report containing the evaluations jointly to the Director and the Administrator.

(b)(1) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives a report that shall include—

(A) a comprehensive assessment (including information identifying the metrics and data used) of compliance by each agency, and by the Federal Government generally, with the criteria and instructions disseminated under subsection (a)(1);

(B) a detailed description of the actions, activities, and other efforts made by the Administrator over the year preceding submission to support such compliance at agencies and any planned efforts in the coming year to improve compliance at agencies; and

(C) a list of recommendations that agencies or Congress may take to help support that compliance.

(2) The Administrator shall ensure that the reports required under this subsection are made available on a public website and are maintained as an open Government data asset (as that term is defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code).

SEC. 751. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, the head of each Executive department and agency is hereby authorized to transfer to or reimburse "General Services Administration, Federal Citizen Services Fund" with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act, including rebates from charge card and other contracts: *Provided*, That these funds, in addition to amounts otherwise available, shall be administered by the Administrator of General Services to carry out the purposes of the Federal Citizen Services Fund and to support Government-wide and other multi-agency financial, information technology, procurement, and other activities, including services authorized by 44 U.S.C. 3604 and enabling Federal agencies to take advantage of information technology in sharing information: *Provided further*, That the total funds transferred or reimbursed shall not exceed \$15,000,000 for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred to or for reimbursement of "General Services Administration, Federal Citizen Services Fund" during fiscal year 2024 shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2025: *Provided further*, That not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed spend plan for the funds to be transferred or reimbursed: *Provided further*, That the spend plan shall,

at a minimum, include: (i) the amounts currently in the funds authorized under this section and the estimate of amounts to be transferred or reimbursed in fiscal year 2024; (ii) a detailed breakdown of the purposes for all funds estimated to be transferred or reimbursed pursuant to this section (including total number of personnel and costs for all staff whose salaries are provided for by this section); and (iii) where applicable, a description of the funds intended for use by or for the implementation of specific laws passed by Congress: *Provided further*, That no transfers or reimbursements may be made pursuant to this section until 15 days following notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 752. (a) Any non-Federal entity receiving funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act for fiscal year 2024 that are specified in the disclosure table submitted in compliance with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or Rule XLIV that is included in the report or explanatory statement accompanying any such Act shall be deemed to be a recipient of a Federal award with respect to such funds for purposes of the requirements of 2 CFR 200.334, regarding records retention, and 2 CFR 200.337, regarding access by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit, amend, supersede, or restrict in any manner any requirements otherwise applicable to non-Federal entities described in paragraph (1) or any existing authority of the Comptroller General.

SEC. 753. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act may be provided to States, cities, or localities that allow non-citizens to vote in Federal elections.

SEC. 754. None of the funds made available by this Act, or any other Act, may be used to make investments under the Thrift Savings Plan in certain mutual funds that make investment decisions based primarily on environmental, social, or governance criteria.

SEC. 755. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be available to—

(a) classify or facilitate the classification of any communications by a United States person as mis-, dis-, or mal-information; or

(b) partner with or fund nonprofit or other organizations that pressure or recommend private companies to censor lawful and constitutionally protected speech of United States persons, including recommending the censoring or removal of content on social media platforms.

SEC. 756. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be used or transferred to another Federal agency, board, or commission to recruit, hire, promote, or retain any person who either has been convicted of a Federal or State child pornography charge, has been convicted of any other Federal or State sexual assault charge or has been formally disciplined for using Federal resources to access, use, or sell child pornography.

SEC. 757. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act may be provided for insurance plans in the Federal Employees Health Benefits program to cover the cost of surgical procedures or puberty blockers or hormone therapy for the purpose of gender affirming care.

SEC. 758. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or otherwise carry out Executive Order 14019 (86 Fed. Reg. 13623; relating to promoting access to voting), except for sections 7, 8, and 10 of such Order.

SEC. 759. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be obligated or

expended until each agency reinstates and applies the telework policies, practices, and levels of the agency as in effect on December 31, 2019, within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act. In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term “telework” has the meaning given in section 6501 of such title, and includes remote work.

SEC. 760. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to “this Act” contained in any title other than title IV or VIII shall not apply to such title IV or VIII.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 801. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of legal settlements or judgments that have been entered against the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 802. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 803. (a) None of the Federal funds provided under this Act to the agencies funded by this Act, both Federal and District government agencies, that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2024, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditures for an agency through a reprogramming of funds which—

(1) creates new programs;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or responsibility center;

(3) establishes or changes allocations specifically denied, limited or increased under this Act;

(4) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or responsibility center for which funds have been denied or restricted;

(5) re-establishes any program or project previously deferred through reprogramming;

(6) augments any existing program, project, or responsibility center through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$3,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or

(7) increases by 20 percent or more personnel assigned to a specific program, project or responsibility center, unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(b) The District of Columbia government is authorized to approve and execute reprogramming and transfer requests of local funds under this title through November 7, 2024.

SEC. 804. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senators or United States Representatives under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiatives of 1979 (D.C. Law 3-171; D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-123).

SEC. 805. Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds made available by this Act or by any other Act may be used to provide any officer or employee of the District of Columbia with an official vehicle unless the officer or employee uses the vehicle only in the performance of the officer's or employee's official duties. For pur-

poses of this section, the term “official duties” does not include travel between the officer's or employee's residence and workplace, except in the case of—

(1) an officer or employee of the Metropolitan Police Department who resides in the District of Columbia or is otherwise designated by the Chief of the Department;

(2) at the discretion of the Fire Chief, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(3) at the discretion of the Director of the Department of Corrections, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(4) at the discretion of the Chief Medical Examiner, an officer or employee of the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(5) at the discretion of the Director of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency, an officer or employee of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(6) the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and

(7) the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 806. (a) None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia Attorney General or any other officer or entity of the District government to provide assistance for any petition drive or civil action which seeks to require Congress to provide for voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

(b) Nothing in this section bars the District of Columbia Attorney General from reviewing or commenting on briefs in private lawsuits, or from consulting with officials of the District government regarding such lawsuits.

SEC. 807. None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to distribute any needle or syringe for the purpose of preventing the spread of blood borne pathogens in any location that has been determined by the local public health or local law enforcement authorities to be inappropriate for such distribution.

SEC. 808. Nothing in this Act may be construed to prevent the Council or Mayor of the District of Columbia from addressing the issue of the provision of contraceptive coverage by health insurance plans, but it is the intent of Congress that any legislation enacted on such issue should include a “conscience clause” which provides exceptions for religious beliefs and moral convictions.

SEC. 809. (a) None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative.

(b) No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used to enact any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative for recreational purposes.

SEC. 810. No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority shall be expended for any abortion except where the life

of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 811. (a) No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the Council of the District of Columbia, a revised appropriated funds operating budget in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-204.42), for all agencies of the District of Columbia government for fiscal year 2024 that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns all budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) This section shall apply only to an agency for which the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia certifies that a reallocation is required to address unanticipated changes in program requirements.

SEC. 812. No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the Council for the District of Columbia, a revised appropriated funds operating budget for the District of Columbia Public Schools that aligns schools budgets to actual enrollment. The revised appropriated funds budget shall be in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-204.42).

SEC. 813. (a) Amounts appropriated in this Act as operating funds may be transferred to the District of Columbia's enterprise and capital funds and such amounts, once transferred, shall retain appropriation authority consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(b) The District of Columbia government is authorized to reprogram or transfer for operating expenses any local funds transferred or reprogrammed in this or the four prior fiscal years from operating funds to capital funds, and such amounts, once transferred or reprogrammed, shall retain appropriation authority consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(c) The District of Columbia government may not transfer or reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

SEC. 814. None of the Federal funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 815. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law or under this Act, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2023 from appropriations of Federal funds made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2024 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2025, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines outlined in section 803 of this Act.

SEC. 816. (a)(1) During fiscal year 2025, during a period in which neither a District of Columbia continuing resolution or a regular

District of Columbia appropriation bill is in effect, local funds are appropriated in the amount provided for any project or activity for which local funds are provided in the Act referred to in paragraph (2) (subject to any modifications enacted by the District of Columbia as of the beginning of the period during which this subsection is in effect) at the rate set forth by such Act.

(2) The Act referred to in this paragraph is the Act of the Council of the District of Columbia pursuant to which a proposed budget is approved for fiscal year 2025 which (subject to the requirements of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act) will constitute the local portion of the annual budget for the District of Columbia government for fiscal year 2025 for purposes of section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-204.46, D.C. Official Code).

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) shall cease to be available—

(1) during any period in which a District of Columbia continuing resolution for fiscal year 2025 is in effect; or

(2) upon the enactment into law of the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 2025.

(c) An appropriation made by subsection (a) is provided under the authority and conditions as provided under this Act and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by this Act.

(d) An appropriation made by subsection (a) shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for such project or activity during the portion of fiscal year 2025 for which this section applies to such project or activity.

(e) This section shall not apply to a project or activity during any period of fiscal year 2025 if any other provision of law (other than an authorization of appropriations)—

(1) makes an appropriation, makes funds available, or grants authority for such project or activity to continue for such period; or

(2) specifically provides that no appropriation shall be made, no funds shall be made available, or no authority shall be granted for such project or activity to continue for such period.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect obligations of the government of the District of Columbia mandated by other law.

SEC. 817. (a) Section 244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia (sec. 9-1201.03, D.C. Official Code) does not apply with respect to any railroads installed pursuant to the Long Bridge Project.

(b) In this section, the term "Long Bridge Project" means the project carried out by the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia to construct a new Long Bridge adjacent to the existing Long Bridge over the Potomac River, including related infrastructure and other related projects, to expand commuter and regional passenger rail service and to provide bike and pedestrian access crossings over the Potomac River.

SEC. 818. Not later than 45 days after the last day of each quarter, each Federal and District government agency appropriated Federal funds in this Act shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a quarterly budget report that includes total obligations of the Agency for that quarter for each Federal funds appropriation provided in this Act, by the source year of the appropriation.

SEC. 819. None of the funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used to carry out the Reproductive

Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20-261) or to implement any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out such Act.

SEC. 820. (a) Section 602(a) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1 206.02(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting ";" or ";" and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(11) enact any act, resolution, rule, regulation, guidance, or other law to permit any person to carry out any activity, or to reduce the penalties imposed with respect to any activity, to which subsection (a) of section 3 of the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997 (42 U.S.C. 14402) applies (taking into consideration subsection (b) of such section).".

(b) The Death With Dignity Act of 2016 (D.C. Law 21-182) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 821. (a) No later than 60 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act the District of Columbia shall submit a report to the Committees regarding the District of Columbia's enforcement of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act.

(b) The report submitted shall include:

(1) how health care providers within the District of Columbia are alerted to their responsibility to comply with the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act;

(2) how the District of Columbia responds to potential violations;

(3) how many potential violations have been investigated in the District of Columbia in the past five years;

(4) whether the District of Columbia preserved each child's remains for appropriate examination during the investigation;

(5) whether the District of Columbia conducted a thorough investigation of the death of each child and what each investigation showed;

(6) whether the Chief Medical Examiner was directed to perform an autopsy on each child to determine the method and cause of death in accordance with section 2906 of the Establishment of the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner Act of 2000 (sec. 5-1405 of D.C. Official Code);

(7) whether the District of Columbia directed a subsequent autopsy to be completed by an independent, licensed pathologist to confirm the findings of the Chief Medical Examiner; and

(8) whether the District of Columbia ensured the proper and respectful burial of each child.

SEC. 822. No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Committee directs the District of Columbia to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations regarding maternity care access for D.C. residents. The report should be organized by ward, birth rate, pregnancy-related death rate, and maternal death rate. The report should also include, organized by ward, the number of facilities providing prenatal care, the number of facilities with maternity units, the number of facilities with neonatal intensive care units, and the number of facilities of each type that accept Medicaid.

SEC. 823. None of the funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used by the District of Columbia to enact or carry out any law which prohibits motorists from making right turns on red, including "Safer Streets Amendment Act of 2022 D.C. Law 24-0214).

SEC. 824. None of the funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority

may be used to carry out title IX of the Fiscal Year 1997 Budget Support Act of 1996 (sec. 50-2209.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code).

SEC. 825. (a) Section 5 of the Corrections Oversight Improvement Omnibus Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-344) is repealed, and the provision of law amended by such section (section 16-5505, District of Columbia Official Code) is restored as if such section had not been enacted into law.

(b) Subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Corrections Oversight Improvement Omnibus Amendment Act of 2022.

SEC. 826. None of the funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used to carry out the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-345).

SEC. 827. An individual who has a valid weapons carry permit from any United States state or territory may possess and carry a concealed handgun in the area governed by the District of Columbia and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA).

SEC. 828. The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112-10) is amended in section 3014 (sec. 38—1853.14 D.C. Official Code)—

(1) In subsection (a) In the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “through fiscal year 2023” and inserting “through fiscal year 2027”;

(2) In paragraph (1), by striking “one-third” and inserting “one-half”;

(3) In paragraph (2), by striking “one-third” and inserting “one-sixth”; and

(4) In paragraph (3), by striking “one-third” and inserting “one-third”.

SEC. 829. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to “this Act” contained in this title or in title IV shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this title or of title IV.

TITLE IX

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 901. \$0.

This division may be cited as the “Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2024”.

The Acting CHAIR. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 118-269, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 847, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

Each further amendment printed in part B of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 847, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be consid-

ered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 847, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WOMACK OF ARKANSAS

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 847, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 29, 33, 34, 36, 66, 67, 71, and 75 printed in part B of House Report 118-269, offered by Mr. WOMACK of Arkansas:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO OF NEW YORK

Page 2, line 22 after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000) (reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 5, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 99, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 102, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 5, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$90,000) (reduced by \$90,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 5, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$37,000,000)”.

Page 99, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$37,000,000)”.

Page 102, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$37,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

Page 7, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. BEATTY OF OHIO

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DAVID SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000) (decreased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 10, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$62,861,000) (increased by \$62,861,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

Page 16, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 16, line 12 after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MRS. RAMIREZ OF ILLINOIS

Page 41, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$27,200,000)”.

Page 41, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$27,200,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. DAVID SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Page 73, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000) (decreased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

Page 91, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO OF NEW YORK

Page 95, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$50,000,000) (reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS OF OKLAHOMA

Page 119, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Page 132, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

Page 132, line 12, after the first dollar amount insert the following: “(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

Page 132, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the sale or transfer of the National Archives facility located at 6125 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, Washington, 98115.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MRS. KIM OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including titles IV and VIII, may be used to oppose a proposal to admit Taiwan as a member of the International Monetary Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO OF NEW YORK

Page 132, line 12 after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 133, line 9, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000) (reduced by \$500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan en bloc amendment that has the endorsement of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Breaking news: This en bloc has proven that Democrats and Republicans can work together and find common solutions—on some things anyway.

The amendments set forth in this en bloc highlight the priorities in the Financial Services and General Government bill that address critical policies to strengthen our economy and bolster our workforce, and I look forward to incorporating these amendments into my bill.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague and good friend Ranking Member HOYER for his consultation and all Members who have worked with me on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on the en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, let me highlight three amendments within the en bloc that are particular to communities in districts like mine.

First, financial literacy is critically important, particularly in rural communities like the ones I represent in upstate New York. The best path forward for someone to achieve independence is obviously hard work and good financial decisionmaking.

Amendment No. 1 encourages the Department of the Treasury to continue to invest in financial literacy initiatives for students and, in particular, reach young people in rural communities like those in upstate New York.

I was shocked, Mr. Chairman, upon becoming a Member of Congress, that there are constituents within many districts across the country, in particular in upstate New York, who were not receiving actual mail delivery. I know this is perhaps not unique to my district. However, with thousands of individuals who have moved into upstate New York, the Catskill region communities, the post office has yet to acknowledge their very existence, whether it is simply offering them a physical mailing address or delivering their mail.

Amendment No. 71 that I have submitted would address this glaring oversight and, quite frankly, incompetence within Sullivan County in upstate New York in my district, where the United States Postal Service has completely ignored these constituents and where thousands of them are not yet able to receive mail.

Therefore, this amendment highlights the need that the American taxpayer should be entitled to the constitutionally recognized delivery of mail service.

Lastly, amendment No. 23 addresses for senior citizens spam calls and tar-

geted fraud cases. The FTC data shows that consumers lost an estimated \$8.8 billion to scams in 2022. My amendment encourages the FTC to coordinate with other agencies like the DOJ and the FCC to ensure our data is protected and seniors are not victims.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment, which highlights the importance of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN, to protect our financial system from illicit activities, combat money laundering, and promote the United States’ national security.

As we speak, oligarchs, kleptocrats, and other criminals are using anonymous shell companies to engage in money laundering, terrorist financing, tax fraud, corruption, bribery, and other illicit activities.

FinCEN is working tirelessly to implement the Corporate Transparency Act’s beneficial ownership rule to increase transparency and, yes, to follow the money to pursue bad actors, from Russian oligarchs to drug traffickers and, more recently, terrorist groups.

Particularly in the wake of the recent Hamas attack, it is evident how vital the bureau’s work is to direct and deter financial streams for terrorist groups, so I ask that we support this amendment.

Unfortunately, House Republican’s Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act cuts FinCEN’s funding by more than 12 percent and would necessitate significant personnel layoffs.

My colleagues across the aisle claim to prioritize national security while simultaneously undermining the very offices at the Treasury tasked with safeguarding our financial system. This office is already stretched thin, working hard to fulfill its mandate with the limited resources it has. Let’s not further hamstring the bureau’s national security efforts with a 12-percent budget cut.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman’s amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am proud to have introduced a bipartisan amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill to highlight the importance of protecting election workers with my friends, Congressmen MIKE LEVIN, JUAN CISCOMANI, SEAN CASTEN, and CHRIS DELUZIO.

From the failed former President doxxing Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss to the Fulton County election director, registration chief, and their staff getting death threats and being

called every racial slur imaginable, my state has become ground zero for harassment and attacks on election workers. Y’all, when I say Georgia is the center of the political universe, this is not what I usually have in mind.

The Federal government needs to step up to protect election workers: the foot soldiers of our democracy. They ensure our constituents’ voices are heard at the ballot box smoothly and efficiently, and ensure we all get election results quickly and reliably. But because of the constant attacks and harassment they face, election workers are leaving their jobs at a terrifying rate, depriving our constituents of their right to a well-functioning democratic system. That’s why I’m so grateful for this bipartisan group of Members who have come together to advocate for anti-doxxing protections and data and physical security resources for election workers, so that we support them the way they support our democracy.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

The amendments en bloc was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$21,000,000) (reduced by \$21,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States, CFIUS, is the chief body responsible for monitoring foreign financial influence in our Nation and the national security risk it poses.

My amendment would direct CFIUS to evaluate the rising threat of U.S. agricultural operations owned by adversarial nations.

Food security is national security, and recent reports have indicated a disturbing trend of increased ownership of farm operations by entities with ties to the Chinese and Russian Governments, which is alarming and dangerous.

Whether it is actual farmland or advanced agribusinesses, adversarial control over these entities provides adversaries the opportunity to spy on our military assets, steal revolutionary ag technology and research, and undermine the United States food system.

This issue has garnered bipartisan support on the Agriculture Committee because it is essential for the protection of American agriculture and for the protection of our family farms.

CFIUS could be a critical tool in better evaluating this risk and improving our response to this threat.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, this amendment, of course, is an add and subtract and will have no fiscal impact, and the policies do bear problems on this side of the aisle as to the implications they may have.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, sending a powerful message to our adversaries that America's food security is our national security is important and critical.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title I, strike the item relating to "Community development financial institutions fund program account".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates funding for the Department of the Treasury's Community Development Financial Institutions Fund.

This amendment, if passed, would save \$280 million in fiscal year 2024.

Let me emphasize one more time that in putting together all these appropriations bills, the goal of all Members should be to reduce the level of spending.

In the year that has just wrapped up, we are borrowing 22 percent of every dollar spent. If you are borrowing 22 percent of every dollar spent, you have a big problem. Even if we stick to the numbers that we agreed to in raising the debt limit bill, next year, the

amount we are borrowing will be equal to 23 percent of every dollar spent.

Mr. Chair, we have a real crisis here. Things are getting worse and worse as we go through these appropriations bills, so we should be looking for fewer ways to spend money and return it to the Treasury.

The CDFI Fund provides grants to community development financial institutions, community development entities, and other private financial institutions. As a result of that, this amendment not only saves money but saves money by taking away money from a fund that frequently results in public-private partnerships.

□ 1030

I think there is nothing worse than public-private partnerships, because it means what you are doing is you wind up enriching already wealthy people at the expense of the taxpayer and allowing people in the community to become wealthier, not by necessarily doing something that is better for the community or successful in the free market. You become wealthier by schmoozing with the local elected officials.

I think it is corporate welfare. I don't like corporate welfare. I think over time, more and more people are getting wealthy, not by providing something that would be winnable in the free market, but they do something by taking advantage of grants and credits offered by the government.

I will quote The Heritage Foundation: "The only rigorous empirical assessment of the NMTC to date found the program to be largely ineffective at meeting its goals of increasing community investment and development. The study found that most CDE investments were relocated investments rather than new net investments"—in other words, transferring one business to another area—"suggesting that 'all NMTC investments do not likely represent new funds to low-income communities.'

President Trump tried to eliminate this in his 2021 budget, showing that President Trump was sometimes a President who was pushing for less spending. In his budget, they noted that the CDFI fund was created to jump-start an industry at a time when CDFIs had limited access to private capital. The CDFI industry now has ready access to capital needed to extend credit and offer financial services to underserved communities, eliminating the need for such grants.

In the interest of ending cronyism, saving some tax dollars, stopping government waste, and getting rid of a program that I think too frequently makes wealthy development types still wealthier, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, Community Development Financial Institutions stimulate economic growth and create and sustain employment opportunities in rural and low-income areas, like a lot of America.

The CDFI fund ensures CDFIs are able to provide these underserved communities access to capital by awarding certified CDFIs with tax credits and monetary support.

I am proud that my own State greatly benefits from the CDFI fund and have seen the far-reaching impact it has had on the community. Defunding the program would only serve to harm the most vulnerable communities in America.

So it is under that pretense, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I will just make one more point here. Assuming some of this money benefits Americans, not just the wealthy wheeler-dealers, we right now—at least if Wisconsin is any indication—have huge surpluses in our State coffers. If it is a good idea, it should be handled by the States, not by the Federal Government that is broke out of its mind.

One of the reasons we are so broke is too many of my colleagues don't look at the Constitution and realize that some things are supposed to be handled by the State and local government and other things are supposed to be handled by the Federal Government. By the time you drip the money down from the Federal Government, there is a huge amount of waste there.

In any event, in the interest of trying to keep our dollar the strong currency it has been throughout our lifetime, I urge adoption of this amendment and send these programs back to the States.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, for the reasons stated previously, I urge rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 133, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, a couple years ago, we dove into post offices, particularly those that did not appear to be financially vibrant and surviving. We realized much of the data we were working on had holes in it. We couldn't get certain lease costs or were they real estate owned.

All I am trying to do here is just get updated data, because at some point we are going to go back through. You have all been watching the accounts. We are going to go back through that discussion again of how we shore up the finances of the U.S. postal system. It would be nice if we go into that having actually high-quality information and the optionality that information would provide us. That is as complicated as this one is.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I recognize my friend and thank him once again for his courtesy on the floor. I reluctantly oppose his amendment.

The United States Postal Service is a service. Every one of us knows that there are some of the facilities that serve rural areas, in particular, that on a cost basis would not be there if it were not a service and we did not deem the rural areas needing service. Therefore, it is across the enterprise itself that we are looking at their finances.

Therefore, to put the United States Post Office to the pretty extensive analytical chore of determining each post office, particularly in rural areas—now, I represent some rural and some suburban, but I think this would be a burden and add paperwork without giving us a result.

When I say not giving us a result, Mr. Chair, let us say that post office A, B, and C were making a profit and D, E, and F, if you look at the unit, that is the single post office, were not making a profit, but nevertheless that neighborhood needs to be served. It is the overall profit or loss of the postal department providing the service to all Americans that I think is the criteria that we ought to be looking at.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, what the ranking member is saying is fair.

The goal here is to have much better information, because the reality is we are going to go back through that uncomfortable exercise again. It is probably a year or 2, maybe 3 years out. The world has changed. This is one of the great difficulties we have around here, and it is sometimes hard to accept.

In a weird way, we are sort of a protection racket. We protect incumbent models of business, incumbent processes, incumbent bureaucracies, but how many of us are now paying our bills on this thing? How many of us are communicating on this thing and not licking an envelope with the risk of a paper cut? Come on, that was funny.

The world is different. I know we have a certain sensitivity to the history and to the communities, but we are going to have to deal with the financial realities that is modern America. That is all I am trying to do. If we are going to deal with those, let's have quality information so we understand.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. BICE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000) (increased by \$5,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment. My amendment directs the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service to provide Congress with the quantity and types of weapons, weapons systems, ammunition, explosive devices, armored vehicles, drones, UAVs, and chemical weapons, such as tear gas, in their possession.

Since taking office, the Biden administration has repeatedly attempted to supercharge an already weaponized IRS.

According to the watchdog organization Open The Books, the IRS has spent over \$35 million since 2006 to stockpile weapons, ammunition, and gear. Nearly one-third of this \$35 million, or roughly \$10 million, has been spent in the last 3 years alone. The report also mentions the purchase of tactical lighting, optical sights, ballistic helmets, and similar items.

This is not a new issue, and it is not new to Oklahomans. The late Dr. Tom Coburn, the godfather of oversight and a great Oklahoman, previously raised similar questions and never received adequate responses from the IRS.

In July, I sent a letter to IRS Commissioner Daniel Werfel requesting information on this issue, including:

Details on the accounts that the IRS had used to purchase such weapons, gear, and ammunition.

Data on the quantity and types of items used in the possession of the IRS.

Information on the specific types of modifications to IRS-issued weapons that had been approved, and the number of these requests that have been approved.

This is vital information, because part 9 of the Internal Revenue Manual, titled Criminal Investigation, outlines modifications that can be made to weapons and the process for exceptions. Proper oversight dictates that we understand the process and the practice.

The IRS still has not replied to my letter. They must be reminded that Congress controls the power of the purse and has oversight authority. Americans are rightly concerned by the IRS's lack of accountability, and they are frustrated that agencies continue to abuse their power.

Mr. Chair, it comes down to transparency. I fully recognize the historical significance of the IRS and their ability to take down criminal entities. However, the IRS needs to tell the American people exactly what capabilities they have.

When the IRS audits an American business or individual, they first and foremost ask for an asset inventory list. If you don't have one, it is a serious problem. Why does the same agency refuse to provide their own asset list? What are the materials stockpiled?

This is increasingly concerning as we look at recent funding increases due to the so-called Inflation Reduction Act in which the Biden administration provided millions of dollars to hire tens of thousands of new agents.

I will remind my colleagues of the strict rules and processes that are in place on our military as it relates to firearms and munitions. Every military commander must keep a detailed and precise record of munitions, both spent and otherwise. They are expected to measure to the ounce and can receive significant punishment if those numbers do not match up. The IRS should be no different.

Today, the number of armed Federal agents is rapidly approaching the size of the United States Marine Corps. The lines have been blurred between the IRS's role as a regulatory tax agency and a law enforcement agency.

The American taxpayers are providing the funding for these assets. The least they deserve is an accounting of their purchases. My amendment provides much-needed transparency on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, this is a continuation of the majority party's contention that there are these thousands of agents that are going to be at your door armed to the teeth and ready to intimidate you.

□ 1045

That is not true. It is a good political scenario, but it is again the demonizing of people who are trying to catch tax cheats, tax dodgers, criminals, drug dealers, and others; many of whom are very dangerous people and who are very heavily armed themselves.

This is a defund the police argument that the Republicans are making. Why?

Because they want to somehow intimidate.

Frankly, I don't care much about getting this information. I think this information is certainly worthwhile having. It is not worthwhile in terms of its intent to continue ad nauseam and contend something that is not true.

Most of the agents that are going to be hired and have been hired are accountants, tax attorneys, and investigators to go through these voluminous tax returns that are filed by corporations and individuals.

We could have included this in the report language. This is an add-in and then add-out language. It has no fiscal impact. It is unnecessary.

Here we are some 10 days from the close-down of government. We are spending time on a number of these amendments, some of which votes have been asked for, while we twiddle our thumbs until February 17, without having resolved that issue.

I think it is unfortunate that we continue to misrepresent to the American public that we are trying to make sure that people who do not pay their taxes do not put a greater burden on patriotic Americans—small, medium, and large—who do pay their taxes, and to somehow give this moniker or mischaracterization or misinformation that somehow, as they have said over and over again, these armed 87,000 agents—absolutely untrue—are going to be at somebody's door trying to collect their taxes.

We are trying to collect taxes from some pretty bad people. The agents we asked to do that work are doing it for their country and putting themselves in harm's way.

Some assertion that somehow the IRS has become an army of agents showing up at doors with machine guns is absolutely wrong. I hear it all the time.

Apparently, it makes good politics. Apparently, some don't believe that people ought to pay their fair share of taxes, that drug dealers who try to hide their money ought to not have some-

body come to their door or come to their place of illegal business and say: You are a lawbreaker. You are a criminal. You owe us and the American people money, legally. You are doing it illegally and avoiding your taxes.

I hope that this aspersion that somehow the IRS has become this armed army that is assaulting the American people is retracted by those who, for political purposes, continue to spew this argument. It is not fair to those people we ask to conduct the law enforcement business of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Chairman, they could prove that they are not hiding anything and not stockpiling weapons by providing the report that I requested.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, let me correct the record on one thing my friend said. He referred to the continuing resolution that expires not February 17, but this month, November 17. I just didn't want him to give the American people the appearance that we had a lot more time because we don't.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I can assure my friend, I understood the proximity of the date being this month on November 17.

Mr. WOMACK. Exactly.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, if I said February, I thank the gentleman for correcting me.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

In full committee we had a robust discussion. I think the information we are working on right now is back in 2018 from the GAO. It is time for the IRS Commissioner to give us this information.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman for the Bedlam battle victory that they had this past week.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. HARSHBARGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, beginning on line 12, strike "above the levels in the possession of the Internal Revenue Service on July 13, 2023".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to address the Biden administration's reckless decision to use taxpayer dollars to purchase weapons and ammunition for the IRS, which is a tax collection agency.

Last year, the American people were shocked to learn that the Biden administration was providing billions of dollars to the IRS to hire 80,000 new agents, whose job it will be to go after hardworking, middle-class Americans.

The IRS should be focused on assisting our constituents with tax compliance and ensuring Americans receive their entitled refund, not focusing on arming its agents with the aim of further extorting the American taxpayer.

The majority of Americans don't trust the government to be good stewards of their tax dollars. Arming the IRS certainly will not inspire new hope in our system.

Let me make one thing clear. Washington does not have a tax collection problem. It has a spending problem.

By disarming our tax collectors, this amendment offers us an opportunity to refocus the image of the IRS and restore faith in our government. After all, under President Biden, our agencies have been weaponized enough.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, as I mentioned before in the previous debate, we had a robust debate in full committee and adopted an amendment which capped IRS firearms and ammunition levels as of July 13, 2023. I think that is reasonable.

This amendment would remove that cap. I understand that some of my colleagues have concerns about Federal agencies holding vast amounts of firepower. We need to be careful not to deprive our agencies of the ability to purchase firearms to carry out their lawful duties.

Mr. Speaker, it is under that circumstance that I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chairman, I understand why the IRS criminal investigation agents carry weapons. I am looking at a 2019 report where it was reported that by the end of 2017 the IRS already had 4,487 guns and over 5 million rounds of ammunition. I don't know what they need that for.

When we have more agents carrying weapons than we do marines carrying weapons, that is a problem.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I adopt not only his premise that we have language in the bill that was fully debated in committee that will achieve the knowledge that we need.

In addition, I would reiterate, we need to respect law enforcement—whether it is called IRS agents—because people are breaking the law. For whatever reasons, people who are tax cheats or drug dealers laundering money or some ilk like that, any dangerous group of people, particularly when they have got criminal gains, are not paying any taxes, although, it is clearly owed.

It is unfortunate that we continue to, A, defund those folks and limit them. I think the chairman is absolutely right in his objection to this. It demeans the officers who are risking their lives to do the duty that we have given them and they have a sworn responsibility to do.

If they were called the Rolling Heights Police Department, and you said we are going to cap their weapons and do this, I think people on your side of the aisle, with all due respect, would be standing up and saying they are defunding the Rolling Hills Police Department. Isn't that awful?

Because they are called IRS agents who enforce the law, they confront crimes, that somehow they are lesser law enforcement officers and are at lesser risk, I think that is not the case.

Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman in opposition.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I would say, notwithstanding the fact that these Federal agencies engage in law enforcement activities, whether it is IRS or FBI, it doesn't make any difference. They are engaged in some very dangerous activities. Notwithstanding the fact that they are engaged in activities, we should all remember that part of their mission is also to train for these dangerous circumstances.

There are training events and weapons qualifications and all kinds of thing that require the expense of ammunition, maybe not for a nefarious target down range, but in order to be able to make them better at their trade should that circumstance present itself.

Mr. Chairman, it is under those conditions that I reluctantly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chairman, the last thing I heard is that we have a couple people who haven't paid taxes. Hunter Biden is one, and more than likely so is President Biden. The IRS should not be the agency that goes after criminals. That is an agency called the FBI.

If they want to enforce the border with guns, then go after the 8 million plus illegals that are coming across the border and also the known terrorists that we have in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this is my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CRAWFORD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Treasury to design or develop a Central Bank Digital Currency, or establish a United States Central Bank Digital Currency as legal tender.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment expands upon the base tax.

The base tax says that none of these funds may be used to establish a central bank digital currency. A central bank digital currency shouldn't be established. Establishing could mean that it has already been created and waiting in the wings just in case we need it.

For "Star Wars" fans, imagine if we let the empire build the Death Star, as long as they promise not to turn it on. Let's not do that.

Let's not build this thing in the first place. We shouldn't design it or develop it. It shouldn't exist. That is the point of this amendment. Stop wasting your time on something that the American people don't want and Congress hasn't authorized. I think the base tax sort of gets at that, but I wanted to expand upon that to be clear. We don't even want it to exist.

Why is this important?

On March 9 of 2022, the Biden administration released an executive order outlining the administration's approach to the risks stemming from digital assets and blockchain technology. This included a directive to explore a United States central bank digital currency.

□ 1100

On March 1, 2023, the Under Secretary for Domestic Finance Nellie

Lang gave a speech focusing on the administration's efforts thus far to design and develop a central bank digital currency: ". . . a CBDC would involve both a new form of central bank money and, potentially, a new set of payment rails. Both real time payment systems and CBDCs present opportunities to build a more efficient, competitive, and inclusive U.S. payment system."

She announced the creation of the Treasury-led CBDC Working Group to complement the Fed's work on the U.S. CBDC.

These are excerpts from her speech.

Meanwhile, the Federal Reserve has made substantial steps toward developing a central bank digital currency, as well. They have done numerous research on projects on the design, but the San Francisco Fed is actually recruiting and hiring for a senior crypto architect of a central bank digital currency to develop a U.S. central bank digital currency.

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution is clear. The authority for creating money rests with this body, and we clearly aren't authorizing that.

In testimony the chairman of the Federal Reserve has made it clear that they couldn't actually establish it without congressional authorization.

We want them to stop building it.

What is a central bank digital currency?

It is a corruption of the concept of money from its proper use as a store of value and a means of exchange into a tool for coercion and control.

The version that is being studied is the same version that the Chinese Communist Party is implementing in China, which is a centrally managed, centrally controlled database.

Now, I am not saying the United States would automatically do the same things China is doing with it, but it would have the same features where the central government actually sees every single transaction. There is no intermediary. In fact, the central government becomes the intermediary between the person and their own property. It would have a claim on it, but their claim would rest with the Federal Government.

We do not need that kind of money in the United States. We don't want that kind of money in the United States. It is Orwellian, and it is dystopian. Every dystopian future has some version of corrupted money where the money itself is used as a tool for coercion and control.

In fact, the Book of Revelation, what I consider Scripture, talks about this, and in our time we are seeing the technology that could do it. In over 100 countries this kind of design and development work is underway. The United States should not partake in it. It is always depicted as evil, and we should have no part in it.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment. To be very clear, not only do we not want it established, we do not want it to exist.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I have a credit card in my pocket. It is a piece of plastic, and I am sure that 150 years ago or 100 years ago somebody said: Well, that plastic is not money.

Nonetheless, very frankly, most of us no longer carry significant sums of money because we use our credit cards.

Now, I am not an expert on this. This is an authorizing issue. The authorizers on the Financial Services Committee and the experts who deal with this should be deciding whether we ought to even look at it, and that is what this amendment would preclude, looking at an option.

Now, I am sure it is much more complicated than my simple analogy of a credit card, but I guarantee you, Mr. Chairman, if people 100 years ago were told that you can spend this plastic, they would have said: Are you crazy?

Now, I don't know whether or not Treasury or the Federal Reserve will see something that makes it more efficient and effective to transfer money from one place to another, which is what we do with a credit card. We transfer from our bank not by going to the bank and doing a withdrawal slip, we do it by giving somebody plastic, and they then put it in the system and the system puts my money from my account into the seller's account.

Now, I don't know that that is so simplistic as to be inaccurate, but I do say, Mr. Chairman, that it is putting your head in the sand in a very technological age in which we live in which things may be made more effective, more accurate, and more user-friendly. I don't know the answer to that.

Nevertheless, I certainly don't believe that we ought to say: Don't look at the options.

So I would oppose this amendment. I am sure it is well-meaning, and I certainly believe the gentleman is concerned about what China does, and I don't know exactly what they do. I heard his brief explanation, but the fact of the matter is looking at an option—and the gentleman is correct, we would have to approve that option. We, the Congress of United States, the Representatives of the American people, and the Senate, would have to approve that option, and we would have authority over that because, as he said, that is what the Constitution says.

Nonetheless, not looking at options I don't think is a good policy for this country, for any business, or for any family. Look at your options.

Mr. Chair, I urge us to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument is not against the language of this text. The gentleman's argument is about studying

something or researching it, and the clear language does not prohibit research or study. It does prevent designing or developing it. We don't want them to create it.

Research all you like, Mr. Chairman, understand how evil it is. I assure the gentleman I am actually an expert on this field, and I am on the authorizing committee. We have as a committee passed language that prohibits the use of a central bank digital currency by the United States of America.

So the appropriation is aligning with the work of our authorizing committee. This is not legislating or it wouldn't have been made in order. It is a simple prohibition of the use of funds to do certain activities.

We don't want them to create this. They can research, they can come and say: We have studied this, and we think there are some really interesting ideas, and here is a proposal for something that might exist someday.

Mr. Chairman, we simply don't want them to create it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Is the gentleman opposed to the working group that now exists?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The working group I think is within the purview of study and research. We just want to make sure that they don't cross the line into designing and developing, and it looks like they are starting to do that. We don't want them to create something and say: See, it already exists.

We didn't appropriate money for them to do that. We didn't tell them to create it. We just want to be more clear on what we want you to do. By all means, research.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time. First, the gentleman is an expert and knows much more than I do about this. I take that as a given.

Secondly, he is on the authorizing committee. That committee has full authority to do that. He says it wouldn't be in order. It is not authorizing, but it says none of the funds, which means that whatever is going on can't use any funds to do this.

He says it is about creating and not studying. I hear him, but this is an authorizing issue, and it ought to be in the hands and the consideration of the committee of jurisdiction. Apparently, it hasn't moved, which is why the gentleman is now trying to get it through by a backdoor, in effect, of saying none of the funds can be used for the purposes that are ongoing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, I urge its rejection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$635,000,000)”.

Page 217, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$635,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, ever since its ill-advised inception and inclusion in the Dodd-Frank Act, Republicans have been largely unified about many, many issues with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Its unconstitutional, unaccountable leadership structure has been litigated before the Supreme Court. Its unaccountable funding structure—chiefly, the fact that its funding comes from the Federal Reserve and not the duly elected Members of Congress—will likely be addressed during the Court's October session.

None of us know, nor should we presume to know, what the Court will decide on the latter issue. Nevertheless, as written, the underlying bill addresses concerns with the funding structure by funding the CFPB through the regular appropriations process.

This amendment retains that provision at a level of zero.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The CFPB is vital in safeguarding the interests of American consumers.

You are on your own. That is the ongoing message that Americans hear from our Republican colleagues. You are on your own, and we are not going to protect you.

The CFPB serves as an independent agency dedicated to ensuring that financial products and services are fair, transparent, and free from deceptive practices.

Very frankly, we are dealing with trillion-dollar financial institutions. There is no consumer except the most expert who can, on their own, make sure they are getting a fair shake and who can, on their own, make sure they are not getting rolled and make sure that they are not being ripped off.

That is what this agency is supposed to do.

By holding financial institutions accountable, the CFPB protects consumers from predatory lending, fraud, and other forms of financial exploitation.

That is the little guy. That is the little guy who can't do it for himself or

herself and is counting on us to make sure that what is represented to them is, in fact, fair and not, as I said, ripping them off.

The CFPB promotes fair and transparent financial markets by enforcing regulations and consumer protection laws. This oversight helps maintain the integrity of the financial system, fostering trust and confidence among consumers and businesses alike.

If we don't have it, if we zero fund it, then guess what, Mr. Chairman?

Confidence is going to go away.

Guess what, Mr. Chairman?

Financial institutions—some very small, some medium size, the large, maybe they will get away with it, they will be able to sustain themselves—but the financial system will lack confidence, and we know that confidence is critical to the financial community and our economy operating effectively.

The CFPB conducts investigations, issues fines, and enforces compliance to deter companies from engaging in harmful or fraudulent activities, ultimately reducing the risk of financial crises and market instability.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this amendment.

Very frankly, as I have said in the past, in the twenties, we didn't have these—the 1920s, not the 2020s. In the 1920s we didn't have any of these protection agencies. The reason they were created in the thirties was to try to stabilize the markets. Very frankly, we have had an extraordinary market for the most part.

Now, I have been here when we have had some real downturns, and confidence was lost. Nevertheless, if we eliminate CFPB and other like agencies or, frankly, reduce the resources that some agencies like the SEC have to make sure that our markets are safe, secure, and transparent, then our economy is not going to be the kind of economy, frankly, that we want. Very frankly, our economy is not going to be the kind that we have now in terms of a pretty vital, vibrant market creating some 13 million, 14 million jobs over the last 24 months.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is not about politics. This is about our economy, its stability, and the confidence that people have in it. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to me somehow this country made it a couple hundred years without the CFPB, and now we can't wake up in the morning without it.

The CFPB operates off a fundamentally flawed assumption that our fellow Americans, the little guy, is a rube and they lack the agency and the intelligence to choose products and services that fit their needs and, instead, must be infantilized while further empowering a government that does not have their best interests at heart.

Their vilification of mundane services provided by banks and credit

unions leaves our constituents with fewer and more expensive options.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

□ 1115

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Chair, we should be in support of this amendment for one very important reason: The CFPB is unconstitutional.

It is an agency that was given legislative powers through Dodd-Frank, one of the worst pieces of financial regulatory legislation ever to come through this Chamber, and it has no accountability and no oversight from Members of Congress.

They go to the Federal Reserve to get their money. They go out to the public, and they actually are writing regulations that Congress has not even contemplated and putting out oversight that Congress has never actually voted for. They are doing it with no oversight from the people's body.

Just yesterday, the CFPB went to Apple, Google, and the payment firms and came up with new proposed rules on digital wallets when this Chamber has not even come out with legislation around digital wallets or digital assets. We have not done that work in the people's House, so to allow an agency like this to continue to operate with no oversight, to go in and out of any company they choose to based upon the whims of Mr. Chopra, is not constitutional. Furthermore, it is not befitting for an agency under the government of, by, and for the people.

Let me also add that the bill presented by Mr. BARR from Kentucky is a good step in the right direction because it would at least give Congress Article I oversight powers over the CFPB and allow us to do the thing that Mr. PERRY is arguing for, which is zeroing out this agency and eliminating it altogether.

Let's speak to the consumer protections that the gentleman from Maryland has talked about.

Before CFPB, consumer protections actually were within the purview of all the other Federal agencies that are under the oversight guise of Congress. CFPB was created so that they wouldn't have to come here for oversight.

I have no problem with making sure that consumers are protected, but not by a rogue, unconstitutional agency that should not exist.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, we had this discussion a little earlier on Mr. BARR's legislation.

This is before the Supreme Court. You are making a representation that this is unconstitutional. You are going to find out the answer to that probably by early summer of next year. We will be in session. We can respond to that.

This is a matter that ought to be considered out of the Financial Services Committee and reported to the floor, and we ought to consider it.

This was not adopted without thought. You may disagree with the

conclusion that was arrived at, but it had a lot of discussion. By the way, for those of you who have not been here a long time, it had a conference. You may not know what a conference is, but what a conference is, is we pass legislation, the Senate passes legislation, and they go meet.

We hardly do that anymore, unfortunately. That is sad, in my view. I have been here for a long time, and conferences are good. That is the way the process ought to work, as opposed to just putting something here and zero funding an agency that was created.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair rather than to other Members.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I remind everybody that the CFPB was an all-Democrat conference. There were no Republicans.

Mr. CHAIR. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I fully support Chairman PERRY's amendment.

This agency is a rogue agency. Let me give an example to my friend to my left. The CFPB is irresponsible and reckless. In February 2023, a CFPB employee made an unauthorized transfer of records to a personal email account containing personal information of 256,000 customers. It affected over 45 institutions.

We sat with Mr. Chopra during a hearing. He is unregulated. I don't know if you have ever been on a bank board, but they are the most regulated group.

Do you know who pays the price, the fines, that they come up with through vague, in today's world, climate change? All these customers up here that are trying to borrow money.

It never should have existed. To keep it funded and to keep it as it exists with the personnel, we are going backward.

Mr. CHAIR. I fully support this amendment.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, and I compliment and applaud him for introducing a very legitimate amendment to address the unconstitutional structure of the agency and the fact that they are a rogue agency.

There is no greater critic of the CFPB than me. Ask Mr. Chopra about that. However, I reluctantly rise in opposition, which may surprise my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to the amendment. It is not because the agency doesn't deserve a check the way Mr. PERRY wants but because it is important for this institution that we assert, in the long run, the appropriations power of this body. That is why I support the Womack bill, which funds the agency and deprives the Court of the excuse to uphold the agency.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. RAMIREZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$635,000,000) (reduced by \$635,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chair, the bottom line is this: Undermining the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau harms Americans' financial security.

That is why today I am offering my amendment supporting the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, and its independence, which is essential in protecting Americans from predatory practices.

I offer this amendment at the urging of the Illinois Coalition For Immigrant and Refugee Rights, an invaluable organization in my district.

Established after the 2008 financial crisis, the CFPB protects Americans from predatory financial practices and lenders while fighting discrimination in the financial sector. In its first 12 years, the CFPB has been able to return or restore over \$17.5 billion to American consumers in compensation, canceled debts, and other relief. It has filed over 4 million complaints against companies on behalf of consumers.

My amendment affirms that Congress should not meddle in an independent agency and acknowledges the importance of the Bureau in protecting consumers from exploitative practices, including when it comes to questionable, crushing medical debt. The CFPB's work is incredibly important, especially as medical debt continues to burden communities in my State of Illinois and disproportionately impacts Black and Brown people.

Across the country, 41 percent of U.S. adults currently have unpaid medical or dental bills. I know many of them, and many of them are in my own family.

During my time serving as executive director of an organization that worked to advance economic opportunity, I have seen medical debt destroy individual's and families' financial security and rob them of their financial futures.

Medical debt puts people in impossible positions. They have to choose between seeking necessary healthcare and paying for their basic needs like food, housing, and heat when it is 20 degrees in Chicago.

While we could solve the challenge of crushing medical debt through universal healthcare and Medicare for All, medical debt continues to plague the American people.

We have to protect our communities from abusive and deceitful practices that compound the challenges that everyday Americans face when navigating medical emergencies. One of those deceitful practices is deferred interest medical credit cards. Research from CFPB is exposing the exploitative practices around these medical credit cards, which have average interest rates 10 times higher than our average credit cards.

Let's think about that. Our credit cards already have extremely high interest rates. These are 10 times higher. Patients seeking medical help who are given this option are almost always unaware of the exploitative charges and costs if the full balance is not paid by their deadline.

The CFPB's vital role also includes cracking down on debt collectors who try to trick and coerce patients into paying medical debt that unlawfully exceeds cost caps.

CFPB has been working to remove medical debt from credit reports as medical debt should never be an indicator of someone's worth and should never limit a person's opportunity for a prosperous and thriving life, including access to safe, stable housing and employment opportunities.

That is why, Mr. Chair, it is critical for the CFPB to maintain its independence from congressional meddling so that it can continue to address practices that are harming consumers, especially predatory lending that leads to medical debt, and to hold bad actors accountable.

As someone who is deeply concerned with housing access and affordability, CFPB's work to remove medical debt from credit reports would literally change the outcome for thousands of working families. It would improve the credit scores of millions of Americans, opening up access to rental housing, insurance, the purchase of their first home, and even employment for many who experience barriers due to their low credit scores.

We know that CFPB has reported that debt collectors use inaccurate or outdated information about their medical debt. It is clear that the CFPB serves an essential function in protecting hardworking, everyday Americans from predatory practices and financial exploitation.

Let me say this loud and clear: An attack on the CFPB is an attack on everyday Americans and working families. We must protect the independent funding of the CFPB, and we have to reject every assault on its funding structure.

We have to allow CFPB to move forward with its number one job of protecting the American consumer.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 88, line 25, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$13,050,000)”.

Page 217, line 16, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$13,050,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, my amendment reduces funding for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, to fiscal year 2019 levels, something that Republicans have made a central piece of any spending arrangements in this Congress.

Under the Democrats' fiscal year 2023 omnibus, which every Republican last year voted against, Congress appropriated over \$152 million. The fiscal year 2019 appropriation for CPSC was \$127 million, which, when measured against the proposed appropriation in this bill, represents a relatively modest \$12 million cut.

No one opposes the good intentions behind the CPSC. In fact, this amendment doesn't gut the agency at all. Everyone here wants to make sure that our fellow citizens are safe. However, it is fair to say that the CPSC has certainly gone well beyond basic consumer protection.

Earlier this year, the CPSC indicated that they planned to take action on banning gas stoves. Obviously, that effort failed, but the fact that the CPSC even considered taking action on gas stoves—heaven forbid that the American people feed themselves—is an indication of just how far this agency has gone off the rails. If an agency can regulate indoor air, what can't they regulate?

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, helping the consumer does not seem to be the objective of the amendments that are made to this bill.

My colleagues have heard numerous statements by Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and others about how the consumer is confronted with extraordinarily complicated and big agencies, and relying on the fact that what is being sold to them or given to them—sold to them, for the most part—is safe to use.

They don't have labs to analyze whether that is the case. They don't have researchers able to understand that. It is not that they are dumb. Somebody said that I thought that they were rubes. That is baloney. I think they are smart, bright people.

□ 1130

They don't have the capacity to really know what is in that product. They can't analyze it. They don't know what toxins may or may not be in it. That is what this agency is about.

This would reduce the Consumer Product Safety Commission's funding below the fiscal year 2019 levels. Well, that was now 5 years ago. We are doing the fiscal year 2024 budget now. It clearly would harm individual consumers who rely on their work, period. It would harm the Commission's ability to halt dangerous imports from China, investigate deaths associated with consumer products, and research emerging hazards.

This cut of \$13 million would bring the CPSC's funding level down from its fiscal year 2023 funding level of \$153 million to its fiscal year 2019 level of \$127 million, a 20 percent reduction.

Well, consumer, you are on your own. That is what the mantra is: Consumer, you are on your own. I hope that the committee chair would oppose this. As you know, these levels are significantly below the President's budget.

Last year, 32 million people sought medical attention for an injury related to a consumer product. Mr. Chair, 32 million people sought redress for an injury related to consumer products. There were an estimated 57,000 deaths in 2021 related to consumer products.

Under this amendment, imports of consumer goods would be significantly slowed. Companies seeking help with recalls would face significant delays, and CPSC's efforts to address the online sale of dangerous recalled products would be greatly harmed.

Consumer, you are on your own. That is unfortunate because the consumer—our constituents, our fellow Americans—needs to have confidence. They need to have confidence in the banking. They need to have confidence in products that are sold to them, so they have the confidence to buy them, to let their children use them, to have them present in their homes and in their businesses, and, yes, even in their cars.

Mr. Chair, I urge us, as protectors of consumers—not Republicans and Democrats, but as people who want to

protect consumers—to reject this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I agree, and I think we all can agree that we want to keep consumers safe, but this is a modest \$12 million cut to an agency that has gone beyond its purview.

I live in a rural community. I live back in a valley on top of a hill, and on occasion we have ice storms, so having a gas stove is important to me and my family. In rural America, having gas stoves, propane, is important to America, and yet this agency tried to ban gas stoves.

Why? Because they are driven by a political agenda far beyond their mission statement of keeping Americans safe.

This is why we need a modest cut to a rogue agency, to send them a message to get back on track to do their job and quit pushing the woke Biden administration's agenda. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me address the gas stoves. That was a sidebar comment. It wasn't anything about taking gas stoves out of people's homes or out of their yard or anything of that nature. It was a political gem that has been seized on by the majority party to pretend somehow that there was an active effort to take away their Weber from their yard.

It is absolutely untrue. It was a sidebar comment by one commissioner about we need to look at gas stoves. It is like defunding the police or the IRS being an army.

Furthermore, this is not a minor cut. This is a 20 percent cut. Not this amendment, but when you add it to that which was reduced in the bill itself, it is a 20 percent cut in protecting consumers. I think that is a pretty big cut. I urge its rejection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I guess that is Common Core math because attempting to block an increase isn't a cut. We are talking about \$12 million off the current appropriations. That is a modest cut.

By the way, the gas stoves, that was attempted through rulemaking. So my colleague, who I greatly respect, must assume that the American people are stupid because they attempted to regulate and ban gas stoves. That is a fact. It can't be disputed. I am appalled that that was even mentioned, even in passing.

That being said, it should be noted that two Democrat Presidents reduced the size of this agency's budget—both Carter and Clinton—at a time when bipartisan support was there for fiscal restraint. That is what we are asking for. That is what we should do. We should send them a message that enough is enough.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment. We are in a crisis in this country. Our southern border is overrun, spending is out of control, and agencies have gone woke. This Presi-

dent has failed us. It is time we get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a pro forma amendment at the desk. I rise as the designee of the ranking member.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I think my friend has left the floor. Maybe he hasn't left the floor, but let me read this message. They are going to reject it out of hand because it comes from the CPSC. The message says:

For what it is worth, we never proposed a gas stove ban, period. Total nonsense. We had one commissioner say something in an interview, and then the chair shot it down, but there is no staff working on anything like this, no proposal to do anything like this. Same as saying that Congress is doing something because one Member of Congress is introducing the bill.

Defund the police. An army of thousands from the IRS. They ought to stop scaring the American people and giving them misinformation.

That gas stove story is baloney that the gentleman talked about. But it is a really great political talking point they think because the guy with the Weber stove in their yard is going to think the Feds are out to get my Weber. Baloney. However, it is a good talking point because if someone keeps saying a lie over and over and over again, maybe somebody will believe it.

I try to tell the truth when I am on the floor. The Bible tells me the truth shall set you free. Be honest with America.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 95, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$66,830,000)".

Page 217, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$66,830,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the amount available for salaries and expenses of the Federal Trade Commission to FY19 levels at just over \$306 million.

It should come as no surprise that I disagree with the Biden administration's weaponization of the Federal Trade Commission.

Much like other Biden administration approaches to financial services regulation, the FTC policies under Chair Lina Khan threaten to disrupt entire sectors of the American economy by moving away from the consumer welfare standard toward arbitrary metrics that aim to break up companies—or stop them from merging—simply because they are too big.

I mean, we can't even be bothered, as my friend on the other side of the aisle says, with the consumer not having the capacity to determine what is in their best interests, which is affronting enough. I mean, all us dumb rubes out here in America, we don't know what the heck we are going to do without the government to tell us what to do. We can't even do that now. We just have to come up with arbitrary things that we don't like and then weigh in.

The FTC has targeted the following standard businesses and business practices, citing several concerns, including, the charging of advertising and other fees to sellers that sell on Amazon or advertise using online platforms.

Mr. Chairman, when you want to buy something, it is going to cost you something. Somebody has to pay for that. That is how business is done.

Other FTC concerns include the use of noncompete clauses in contracts, and the idea that mergers themselves—rather than downstream effects on consumers—negatively impact consumers.

Unfortunately, this government seems focused on killing successful American business instead of staying out of its way.

Most, if not all, of these practices are agreed upon in contracts between two willing parties. If you don't like what is in the contract provisions, whether it is a noncompete clause or you have to pay for your advertising, there is a simple remedy not involving the government: Just don't sign the contract. It is pretty easy.

In the last couple years, the level of FTC salaries and expenses has increased from just over \$300 million to \$430 million in FY23. That is \$130 million in extra salaries and expenses. I don't need to tell everybody here, I hope, but we are \$33.7 trillion in debt—the last time I checked the debt clock, 2 days ago—and there ain't no end in sight.

As my young daughter told me when she looked at the debt clock for the first time, she said, Well, it doesn't stop. Yeah, no kidding. It doesn't stop, because this place just keeps spending like there is no tomorrow. If we keep

going, there might not be a tomorrow for this country.

I appreciate that the bill's author wrote it at a lower level than FY24. It shouldn't be too tall a request to lower that number even further to prepandemic levels when, oh, by the way, just a couple years ago, the government was still too big and was spending more money than it took in then, especially given the questionable tactics of this administration's FTC.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, You are on your own, consumer. You are on your own, Mom. You are on your own, Dad. That is what they said in the 1920s. I keep repeating it: You are on your own. The markets went wild, and they crashed, and millions and millions and millions of people suffered badly.

This bill already cuts FTC, and this amendment brings salaries and expenses down to its fiscal year 2019 levels, that is to say that it cuts in half the complement of employees at the FTC. That is not a nick. That is a you are on your own.

Boy, the pleaders for doing things that are not legitimate, Mr. Chairman, must be a long line. We don't want to be regulated. Now, I am not calling anybody a rube, but I will tell you, maybe you can.

When I go to the gas station and I put the pump on, and the gas goes in, there is not a single way that I can tell whether that product is what they say it is.

Do you know what I rely on, Mr. Chairman? I rely on—both at the State and Federal level—that somebody is checking on that gas to make sure it is not going to blow up my car. I can't do that. I rely on the government to do it, to make sure that I am safe, to make sure my car is not damaged when I pull that pump and some liquid goes into it.

□ 1145

Why do I presume that? Not because the gasoline company says it is, because the gasoline company may have some incentive to, hey, maybe short-change a little bit of this and short-change a little bit of that.

If somebody is checking, that incentive is eliminated. Just like when people are checking on making sure you are paying your taxes or doing the speed limit on the road. They think somebody's checking, so they are more likely to do that. They are more likely to pay their taxes.

To the extent that the other side continues to try to nip away at the protections for the consumers and the investors and the purchasers of food and drugs and other items of consumer products, to the extent that we erode that, we are going to erode this economy, and we are going to diminish the

quality of life for people and their security.

This agency was reduced significantly by this committee, and this is not just a nick at it. It is a cut of the muscle and the ability to do the job consumers and constituents, we call them, expect it to do for them, their families, and their children. I oppose this amendment and urge its rejection.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, the good gentleman from the State of Maryland says, well, you are on your own. You are on your own. I don't know.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. PERRY says that. I don't say that.

Mr. PERRY. Well, the gentleman said it over and over again—you are on your own, implying that we are saying you are on your own.

In 2019, we were on our own somehow, I guess, because that is what this goes back to. Somehow, we made it to 2023, by the grace of God, I guess, because the good gentleman also refers to the twenties, so I imagine it is the 1920s.

Well, it is the 2020s, and things have changed a little bit. I know that my good friend from the other side of the aisle and I are a little bit older, but neither of us were around in 1920. Things have changed a little bit.

Now, as a young man, I pumped gas for a living. I do know the difference between gasoline and diesel and kerosene because I have a nose, and I can read.

Sure. Do mistakes happen? Do people put gasoline in diesel and diesel in gasoline? They changed the size of the nozzle, by the way, in case you can't figure that out. If you can read, and most people in America can read, they can figure it out.

The point is, we are not a bunch of rubes, and we don't need the government to figure out all this stuff for us.

We don't need the government wiping our rear end every time we go to the bathroom, but that is what you would have us believe, that that is what we need, that Americans are so dumb, they can't do it without the Federal Government.

Somehow this country survived a couple hundred years, and not only survived, became the greatest country on the planet, and it wasn't because the Federal Government was wiping our rear end the whole way.

I urge adoption, and I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I am going to dignify that with an extensive response. I think the American public are very bright, but they don't have assets.

You may smell the gasoline. You may be an expert on gasoline. I know what gasoline smells like. I put it in my lawn mower. I put it in my chain saw. I put it in my car. I have no idea beyond the smell what is in there.

That is my point. My point is they expect us to be making sure that when that big gas tanker rolls in that gas station and puts that liquid in there that it is something they can use in their car and it won't hurt their car and it won't hurt them. That is my point.

Don't misrepresent my position as saying Americans are dumb. They are not dumb. They are smart. They are smart enough to know that they need somebody checking up on the quality of that gas before they put it in their car.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 25 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. BRECHEEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 99, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,735,000)".

Page 102, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,735,000)".

Page 217, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,735,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is going to return funding for the General Services Administration, GSA, real property activities of the Federal buildings fund back to fiscal year 2019 levels. It is a modest cut of \$12.7 million.

For context, this amendment would cut 0.5 percent of the entire bill. I will repeat that: 0.5 percent is what this amendment proposes. This is one-half of one percent.

This amendment returns spending for this specific funding back to pre-COVID discretionary spending levels. To my colleagues, discretionary outlays by our Federal Government totaled \$1.7 trillion last year, and last year's deficit was \$1.7 trillion.

That means 100 percent of discretionary spending is borrowed from our kids and our grandkids. That means 100

percent of all that we are discussing these last many weeks is borrowed money. We have to start cutting significantly.

Can we not go back to fiscal year 2019 as a start? Is that not enough government that we experienced in 2019?

This amendment cuts a modest \$12.7 million from a \$5.7 billion allotted amount for rental space that is not even being fully utilized by our Federal agencies.

The Government Accountability Office, GAO, released a report titled Federal Real Property Preliminary Results that show Federal buildings remain underutilized due to longstanding challenges and increased telework.

This report assessed 24 different Federal agencies' and departments' use of building space. The review was conducted between January and March of this year, long after the COVID-19 pandemic ended.

Mr. Chairman, 17 of those 24 agencies the GAO identified and listed utilized only 25 percent or less of their headquarter building capacity. Even on the higher range, these agencies only used between 39 to 49 percent of their headquarters on average.

For one agency the GAO did not name, GAO calculated that even if all of its agency staff were physically present in its headquarters, only 67 percent of the facilities would be occupied.

The same report detailed that underutilized office space cost 24 agencies mentioned in the report \$2 billion a year—\$2 billion a year—lost due to wasted office space, and that was only for maintenance and operation costs. These agencies spend over an additional \$5 billion on leasing space.

At a January 2023 meeting between the Federal Real Property Council, more than half of the participating agencies acknowledged that their headquarter buildings had excess space even prior to the pandemic. These are the headquarter offices. Not much less do we need to talk about the satellite offices.

The GAO report also mentioned that all 24 agencies have reduced their in-office work and have not returned to prepandemic levels because of remote work.

Even before the pandemic, Federal agencies struggled to determine how much space they needed to fulfill their missions.

Retaining excess and underutilized space is one of the main reasons Federal real property management has remained on the GAO high-risk list since 2003. For 20 years, GAO lists this problem among its high-risk list. It is a 20-year problem.

The GAO high-risk list seems to identify and help resolve serious weaknesses in areas that involve substantial resources.

More than half of GSA's leases, which account for 83 million square feet, are set to expire between 2023 and 2027. Therefore, the time to reduce this

inefficiency must be now. This amendment can help achieve that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this bill urges every Federal agency to return people to the offices, and then where are you? Well, we don't need the offices now, so we can save money.

You can't have it both ways. If you want people to return, you are going to need office space for them, and you are going to need to maintain it.

By the way, operational costs are going to go up and capital costs are certainly going up when you purchase Federal space. Existing Federal space may not be in the right place, and maybe you need to go rent something, as well.

Here, rental space is already cut by \$158 million. It is not a nickel-and-dime there. It is a significant decrease. This amendment brings that total down to fiscal year, as has been said, 2019 levels.

I don't know. I haven't read the amendment, so I don't know whether it keeps rental costs down to 2019 levels or construction costs down to 2019 levels or other expenses attributable to the maintenance and acquisition of property. I think it doesn't and, obviously, constitutionally it couldn't do that.

Reducing the revenues without reducing the costs is going to cause, obviously, a very substantial imbalance in the ability of GSA to operate effectively.

This cut would bring the GSA's rental of space funding level down from fiscal year 2023 to fiscal year 2019 \$5.4 billion, a 3 percent reduction. It is six times higher than a 0.5 reduction, but, nevertheless, not insignificant.

GSA plays a critical role, as all of us know, in managing Federal real estate procurement and tech services, by the way, including our own offices.

Reduced funding may lead to delays, inefficiencies, and increased costs in government activities. The chairman is not here, but I know that he believed, because that is what he proposed and that is what was adopted, that the appropriate reduction was \$158 million.

Now, in addition to that, of course, we had an agreement at 2023 levels, and 149 Republicans voted for that agreement. I don't know whether the gentleman who offered this amendment, Mr. Chairman, was one of them. It doesn't really matter. A large number of us voted for that—314 Members in total.

Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of the Congress voted for a level of funding, which the Senate is doing because they believe that is the appropriate level.

In light of the fact that it has already been reduced very substantially,

I would strongly oppose this amendment and urge the Congress to reject it and the House to reject it.

Remember, they have office space, and they are worried about their own office space either as rented in the private sector or in public buildings. They pay an offset in the public buildings.

Each Member should think of what has happened to their costs and act accordingly and don't expect others in the Federal Government to do what we are not doing ourselves.

I would ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and stay with the reduction that has been made which I, frankly, think is excessive myself, but, nevertheless, a very substantial reduction already.

Going to fiscal year 2019 levels was not contemplated by anybody that voted just a short while ago on the agreed funding levels in this bill.

Now, I want to be fair. The agreed funding levels were not by item. It was an overall cap. Contemplating a cut of this nature is going to severely undermine the ability to operate in an efficient, effective way. GSA, I think, does that and needs the resources to do it on behalf of all Americans.

Getting those people back in offices is a good optic, but reducing the ability to maintain those at the same time is not good business.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate that, this last year, GAO said 17 of the 24 agencies that they surveyed used only 25 percent of their headquarters office space. That means 75 percent of office space in the headquarters of the largest agencies is vacant.

This is just returning back to 2019 levels. We are talking about \$12 million in cuts for what the GAO says is a \$7 billion problem.

For 20 years, they have been talking about this, so much so that it has been on their high-risk list for years.

If we are going to account for a \$1.7 trillion deficit, can we start by cutting millions out of billion-dollar problems?

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRECHEEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. BURLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 115, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000) (increased by \$20,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman

from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would increase/decrease funding to express that the Office of Personnel Management should renew the security clearance of David Grusch.

Mr. Grusch formerly served as a National Reconnaissance Office representative to the UAP Task Force, from 2019 to 2021. He recently testified before Congress, claiming that partial fragments and even intact vehicles have been found for decades by the Federal Government, our allies, and defense contractors. According to Mr. Grusch, objects and vehicles retrieved are of “exotic origin . . . based on the vehicle morphologies and material science testing and the possession of unique atomic arrangements and radiological signatures.”

Mr. Grusch also told us that the U.S. is in possession of “nonhuman spacecraft” and dead pilots.

Finally, Mr. Grusch told us that he has spoken with intelligence officials whom the U.S. military had briefed about football field-sized aircraft, that the U.S. Government transferred some crashed UAPS to a defense contractor, and that intelligence officials were also briefed on malevolent activity from extraterrestrial beings.

Now, of course, all of this was very interesting to me and a number of my colleagues on the Committee on Oversight and Accountability. My first question for Mr. Grusch, when I had the opportunity, was to say that those were pretty incredible claims, but I am from the Show-Me State, so he would have to show me. I requested specific information that could not be conveyed in that hearing but in a secure setting. Unfortunately, he is unable to provide us with any supporting evidence to back up his claims because his security clearance has lapsed.

My understanding is that Mr. Grusch did go through the proper channels by turning over classified information to the IC inspector general. He ultimately filed a complaint to the IC inspector general, alleging that the information he presented to the IC has been illegally withheld from Congress.

Mr. Chair, I would like to know more about these claims, and so would a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I am certainly pleased that the Committee on Oversight and Accountability is working hard to bring in the relevant inspector general so we can cut through all the roadblocks that have been presented since Mr. Grusch stepped forward. We need to cover all possible angles here, and if we can get Mr. Grusch in a SCIF with an active security clearance, that would go a long way.

This amendment simply expresses support for the Office of Personnel

Management to renew the security clearance of David Grusch so that he can show us his work.

As a freshman Member, I have seen a lot of these increase/decrease amendments. While on its face they appear to not do anything, it is my understanding that the agencies generally pay attention to the legislative history and intent, which is why I am offering this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment number 28 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 127, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague from Arizona and the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, we remember the EIDL loans from during the pandemic. We have some documents that say there may be as much as \$62 billion in impairment. Understand that there is a difference between impairment and delinquency behind those.

We actually have an intense concern on some of the articles and other things that have come to our attention that the collection—look, this is never a happy conversation when you are talking about going out and collecting loans, but this is money that is owed to the hardworking taxpayers. It is only fair. We made a deal.

We actually believe if we take the mean of some of the reports we have been best able to get, there is about \$33 billion that is ready for, functionally, some type of hard collection. They are substantially delinquent.

We are here fighting over dollars. We are fighting over pennies sometimes. If there are billions of dollars out there that are owed back to the Small Business Administration and those things, we have the legal obligation to go collect. That is the deal.

The amendment is trying to move away from an article in The Washington Post that was basically saying the Small Business Administration had either slowed down or stopped pursuing

collections. Let's go collect the money. As we are lifting every seat cushion around here trying to find resources, there is a stack of resources here.

The other thing it would also help us understand is how much fraud ultimately there was in the program, but without the collection efforts, you actually cannot truly document those numbers.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I would make an observation. I understand what the gentleman is saying. The IRS says there are \$688 billion. That is not chump change, not behind the sofa cushion, \$688 billion. They say that if they have the resources, they can collect a large sum of that, which is really what the gentleman is looking to do in this amendment with this agency.

Mr. Chair, this bill provides for a 23-percent cut in enforcement on moneys that are due and owing under the current law to the Government of the United States. The gentleman and previous speakers have said how concerned they are with the deficit. I would think that—again, I will use the collection department of a corporation as the example—you would want to collect that money.

If the principle that the gentleman espouses is a good one, and I frankly think it is, then we ought to apply that to that \$688 billion, which would have a substantial impact on collections.

Let's say we just collected a third of that. That would be more money than all of these cuts combined and perhaps all of these bills. I find it confusing and contradictory that the gentleman would want to collect these debts—of course, the agency says it would cost more to collect than would be collected. That is their position. Whether that is true or not, I am not arguing that, but that is their position, as I understand it.

In the case of the \$688 billion, it is essentially, if you are at the upper end, \$1 of expenditure for \$12 of revenue. Frankly, at the lower end, it is much less, \$1 to maybe \$1.67 or \$1.87. That is a relatively small return on the investment but a big return on the bigger taxpayers, whether they are corporate or individual.

Mr. Chair, I think the principle the gentleman enunciates is a good one. I hope he would pursue it in talking about the IRS' ability to oversee very complicated and lengthy returns that have resources that are not very transparent and are from sources that aren't withdrawn because that might in fact help us get to where he wants to get in reducing that debt.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, let me say to the gentleman from Maryland that he will be happy to know that he actually accepted, en bloc, two of my amendments.

Mr. Chair, I am blessed to chair the Oversight Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, and within there is the use of technology. We have actually had to deal with the reality, if you are actually reading some of the reports that are coming from the IRS, that they can't seem to hire the people to do the audits. Apparently, there is a shortage of people with accounting and that type of talent.

We actually brought two amendments—both made it into the en bloc, so I appreciate that—to actually go and use AI and technology to talk about exactly what the gentleman from Maryland said.

I actually believe in many ways that is more ethical and moral because I can audit an algorithm. I can't audit someone's heart or their personal politics. We actually have demonstrations also on the customer service side with the use of chat AI and those things, but that is IRS. We are here talking about the Small Business Administration.

I am trying to be intellectually consistent. We did our amendments there to pursue a rational use of technology. If it is true that there may be, according to this article, an estimated \$62 billion in past due pandemic loans, if it costs more than \$62 billion for the Small Business Administration to go collect \$62 billion, the world has come to an end. I mean, let's be intellectually consistent here.

This agency has the legal obligation to collect these loans. My fear is there may have been so much fraud that there is almost this discomfort of peeling back the onion and saying one-third of the book or 20 percent of book, whatever it is, will never be performing loans.

Mr. Chairman, to my friend from Maryland, this is actually just moving some money around so the Small Business Administration does what they are actually supposed to be doing and what is actually already part of the loan. We are actually moving some resources so it can be accomplished.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 35 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to implement or enforce General License No. 8H, issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control on October 25, 2023.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the Treasury Department from issuing General License No. 8H, which was issued by the Office of Foreign Asset Control on October 25.

It represents a fundamental policy shift in our approach to Russia and ending its aggression against Ukraine. This amendment is a recognition that the Biden Treasury Department's Russian oil price cap policy has failed. It is not curbing Moscow's war spending because the cap has proven unenforceable, especially outside of the G7.

Russian oil is trading well above the cap, funneling billions of dollars and, in fact, trillions of rubles into Putin's war machine.

□ 1215

It is also a recognition that President Biden and Climate Czar John Kerry's climate agenda and war on American energy has come in direct conflict with our national security and our efforts to counter Russian aggression. Their climate policies have limited the tools available to them and pushed our country into pursuing a woefully ineffective price cap strategy in lieu of closing the huge loophole they created for energy-related transactions in their sanctions on Russian banks.

That is right. For the Americans watching on television who have been given the impression that President Biden is being tough on Moscow, the truth is, they are allowing oil sales to finance the war. That is the Biden policy, to create a huge loophole for energy-related transactions that allows Putin to finance this war.

License number 8H is an extension of authorizations by this administration going back to the very start of the war in Ukraine. It permits U.S. persons to engage in any transaction with sanctioned Russian financial institutions if the transaction involves Russian energy. This is the Biden administration's weak policy toward Russia.

It includes not only Russian energy sales but even production, refinement,

and transport. Despite sanctions, again, on Russia's leading banks, including restrictions on the Central Bank, OFAC licensing has exempted dealings that support the most vital source of export earnings for Moscow.

Why this administration punishes American energy but rewards Putin's energy is beyond comprehension. This is simply perverse. On the one hand, the Biden administration is greenlighting Russia's efforts to earn hard currency for its war machine even as it asks Congress for billions of dollars to defend and reconstruct Ukraine. The left hand destroys while the right hand rebuilds, but somehow the administration is stumped that this war grinds on without end.

Had Biden continued the Trump administration's energy dominance strategy, he would not be as constrained as he is today, and global energy markets would be far less dependent on Russian oil and gas, making a full embargo or sanctions without a general license far less painful for us and our allies.

My amendment says enough is enough. If we really want to help the Ukrainian freedom fighters, we have to end Russia's ability to wage war. That means cutting off every avenue available for it to fund its hostilities.

As The Wall Street Journal reported just this week, Russian tax revenues for oil and gas surpassed \$17 billion last month, an increase of 25 percent from the previous year. These revenues are bolstering Moscow's abilities to threaten Ukraine with the government planning to increase military spending by 70 percent next year.

Under my amendment, the United States will not be complicit in these energy sales. It will ensure that sanctioned Russian banks are, in fact, sanctioned. The loopholes that Russia has enjoyed for over a year, thanks to President Biden, will be closed, and we will send a signal to the world that turning a blind eye to Russian exports is over.

At the same time, passage of this amendment must be viewed in the broader context of the administration's multilateral efforts to ensure the continued supply of Russian energy.

Even if we close off the U.S. and its financial system from these transactions, the Treasury Department has convinced our European allies to roll back EU sanctions under a price cap scheme for oil. Treasury's own data has shown that the price cap still allows Russia to earn billions of dollars each month in oil sales. Moreover, with Urals crude prices rising, the World Bank recently concluded that the price cap "appears increasingly unenforceable."

The only way to counteract this trend will be to acknowledge once and for all that the war in Ukraine will not end until Russian energy dries up. That means enforcing sanctions, not rolling them back. The first place to start is here at home with OFAC licensing.

My amendment is an important step toward this goal. If you want to get

tough on Putin, stop his energy exports.

Mr. CHAIR. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and bring energy dominance back to the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, if you want to get tough on Putin, don't elect one of his friends President of the United States.

This legislation that has been offered, as I understand it, wants to see a full sanction and prohibition on dealing with Russian oil. That may be a worthy objective, but I think the way to do it is to do it. We can pass legislation on that.

As I understand it, 8H is one of the principle ways in which we implement sanctions that we urge. To do away with that ability without replacing it—and I may be wrong in what I am saying, so the gentleman can correct me—does not seem to be a worthwhile objective. In other words, if you need more, let's legislate more sanctions. We can do that. Don't take away sanctions that currently exist, even though, as the gentleman hypothesizes, they are not as effective as they ought to be.

I hear what he is saying. I very much want to help Ukraine. I hope your Speaker brings Ukraine to the floor pretty soon. That is really going to help Ukraine. We need to do it sooner rather than later. We have 300 votes on average to help Ukraine on his side and my side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that is the way we ought to go about it, rather than trying to do it through what is a relatively clumsy, in one sense, way of accomplishing an objective with which I may agree. I don't know all the ramifications of that, and I don't have the information from Treasury as to what adverse impact they think it will have. It seems to me the way to do it is to do it and do it through the legislative process and have that debate and know the consequences of the action that the gentleman proposes.

For that reason, I am opposing the amendment and urge its rejection.

Mr. CHAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the sentiment, and I am with Mr. HOYER on providing support for Ukraine, but the 8H license is actually the loophole. It is the exception to the sanctions.

I give President Biden credit and Secretary Yellen credit and Wally Adeyemo credit for the sanctions on Russian banks and the Central Bank. The problem is the huge loophole they have created with the general license.

What my amendment proposes to do—and I just came from a meeting with Deputy Treasury Secretary

Adeyemo, a great patriot—but what we are trying to say is the price cap is not working; close the loophole, sanction Russian energy exports. I offer that as a bipartisan amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time.

Let me ask something. As I understand it—again, not having the information that he has available to him—one of the reasons those exemptions are given is because of the fear that there will be a substantial price hike if that oil is not on the market and that price hike will then go to what a lot of his colleagues have been talking about, these awful prices at the pump.

Am I correct?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, to answer the question, that is a very good question. That is the key question.

To the administration's credit, they are trying to solve this difficult question: How do we impose sanctions on Russia and Putin without hurting our allies?

Mr. HOYER. And our consumers.

Mr. BARR. And us, because unfortunately our allies are overdependent on Russian sources of energy.

The problem is because of this price cap scheme that they have concocted, Russian oil is trading above the cap, so it is not exactly affecting anything.

The truth is, there are two solutions. Number one is to decrease our and our allies' dependence on Russian gas by increasing our own production. This is where the administration's climate agenda is in conflict with our national security.

Secondly, the general license is the problem. If they repealed the general license and did what Treasury does all the time on sanctions and to help our allies in case-by-case scenarios with a special license—let's say, for Germany in a particular case, okay, that is fine; they retain that authority, Treasury would—but a general license that says Putin can sell all of his energy with no ramifications whatsoever through a general license is not tough on Russia.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. BARR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Executive Order 14008 titled “Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad” (January 27, 2021) or any rule or regulation to implement such Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits funds from being used to implement the Biden administration’s January 2021 executive order titled “Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad.”

The Biden administration issued this executive order under the guise of protecting United States’ national security and foreign policy, yet Republicans see right through this.

This executive order is yet another example of the Biden administration’s effort to circumvent the people’s House and advance their radical anti-American energy agenda by depriving the energy industry of the financing it needs from our capital markets.

Perhaps if we want to work in our national security interests, Mr. Chair, we should bring energy independence and dominance back to the United States by promoting, not working to prevent, the financing of the very capital-intensive energy sector.

We should block misguided ESG initiatives where the ultimate goal is to politicize the allocation of capital and steer investments into the Democrats’ desired climate transition. To protect national security interests, we should pass H.R. 1 and unleash American energy not just for our economy but for our national security.

Instead, unsurprisingly, the Biden administration releases this executive order that calls for the U.S. to rejoin the Paris Agreement, creates a National Climate Task Force consisting of members from multiple Federal agencies, including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Defense, which will result in agencies taking their eye off the ball of real systemic risks in our financial system and global stability to focus on political initiatives and calls for a government-wide approach to the climate crisis.

What might be the most egregious is the executive order’s call to tamper with financial flows to align with a pathway toward low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development. The Biden administration is calling for the government to put its thumb on the scale of free-flowing capital, pick winners and losers, and pursue an agenda to starve energy companies of the financing that they need and redirect capital into speculative green energy technologies that, frankly, are unproven and will not actually fix the climate.

This is in direct contradiction with our national security interests, in-

creases our energy dependence on our adversaries, and is once again showing us Democrats are exploiting the most envied capital system in the world to pursue their most radical and detrimental agendas. My amendment will put a stop to this.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues, for the interest of our economy but also for the interests of national security, to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, first of all, our economy is doing better than almost any economy in the world. I have had numerous debates, Mr. Chair, or discussions with the majority leader in the last Congress. He kept talking to me about American energy. I kept pointing out to him, almost every time he raised it, we were producing more energy than we had under the previous President, and yet they kept wringing their hands about how we were undermining the energy industry.

Now, at the same time we are not undermining the energy industry, we are also trying to deal with an extraordinary crisis that confronts the global community, and that is climate change. This amendment blocks any whole-of-government strategy led by the White House to build a resilience both at home and abroad against the impacts of climate change.

Nationwide, communities are already facing severe impacts that will continue to intensify. In 2022, there were 18 separate billion-dollar weather and climate disasters that impacted the United States: hurricanes, floods, wildfires, droughts, among other events.

□ 1230

We had a very substantial investment we made in alternative energy. Now, I happen to be a huge supporter of alternative energy, particularly in nuclear. I have been a supporter of nuclear energy for a very long period of time. I have a big nuclear plant in my district. It is an alternative clean energy option. I want to see that further expanded. Right now it is somewhat cost prohibitive in terms of getting loans.

Mr. Chairman, at the time of tremendous need and challenge, this amendment will make us less prepared to prevent and withstand the severe impacts of climate change that our country already faces on a regular basis, as does the world.

Industries have recognized that need and are pursuing that need—not as vigorously as they were perhaps last year or the year before that—but pursuing it vigorously. I visited a number of the energy companies themselves who were involved in the fossil fuel industry, also looking at alternative energy because they see that as the future.

This amendment undermines both the focus and the process of moving toward that, which the White House is trying to do. Why?

Because they have a responsibility for all Americans. They have a responsibility to look at more than 24-month cycles.

We, in Congress, are sort of hide-bound by 24-month cycles. We need to look long term. That is what President Biden is trying to do; look long term and be prepared. Be prepared for a time when we are smothering our little globe and heating it up and melting the ice of the world. We are making agriculture unattainable in certain areas. We are making life difficult in certain areas.

It is necessary that we look long term. It is necessary that we have a longer vision. It is necessary that we have an administration that has the ability and inclination to do just that. That is what they are doing.

I think this amendment certainly speaks to one segment of the energy that we have in this country, and that is fossil fuel. We are going to be using fossil fuel for some years to come, maybe some decades to come. We need to look long term at more efficient and effective energy sources that do not cause a danger to humanity.

Mr. Chair, I urge that we not pursue this, we allow the administration to continue its efforts, and we admit that climate change is a crisis happening now.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. BEAN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the Community Advantage Small Business Lending Companies program in the final rule of the Small Business Administration entitled “Small Business Lending Company (SBLC) Moratorium Reversion and Removal of the Requirement for a Loan Authorization”, issued on April 12, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 21890).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. BEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of my amendment No. 39 to H.R. 4664.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WILLIAMS and my colleagues on the Committee on Small Business for their support. This May, the Small Business Administration implemented a rule which disregards Congress' authority and makes its Community Advantage Pilot Program permanent.

This program was created in 2011 and had been continuously reauthorized on a short-term basis by Congress. In fact, it is already authorized to continue operating through September 2024. Not so fast.

The SBA got tired of relying on Congress and taking our directions and decided to make the program permanent by creating an entire new class of lending entities. These new entities are called Community Advantage SBLCs. Now the SBA no longer has to come to Congress to make sure the program continues to operate.

We all know this is not how agencies are supposed to work. If the Community Advantage program was successful, then it is the duty of Congress to evaluate it to make sure it should be permanent. Unfortunately, the SBA does not want to operate in this fashion and removed the elected Members of this body from the equation.

This amendment reasserts congressional authority over the process by prohibiting any funds from implementing and administrating any licenses for the new Community Advantage SBLC's licenses.

Not only does this amendment ensure that Congress' authority is not ignored, but it sends a strong message to all Federal agencies that they cannot act outside of their jurisdiction without consulting Congress.

This is an important step to holding the Federal Government accountable to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this program has been a very successful program. It has been a successful program for the little guy—the small business. The pilot program has proved to be very successful and has been operating over three Presidential administrations.

The program expands access to small business financing for underserved communities, including women, minorities, veterans, and people in low-income areas. Obviously, the lending community believes this is a program that works. The permanent program includes all 112 of the pilot's lenders

who wanted to continue SBA lending, along with 31 new mission-driven lenders that were recently approved.

Mr. Chairman, by blocking the SBA from continuing this program, the amendment would deny economic opportunities for communities and small businesses that need them the most.

I have talked about, you are on your own. This is an area where small businesses need help. This is an area where apparently three administrations thought it was working. Now we are extending it. We hear that it is in the Congress' ambit. Of course it is. We could prohibit this, but the administration has made a judgment that it works. The lending community has made a judgment—apparently they are not losing money on it—that it works.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment, which would prohibit the Small Business Administration from implementing the Community Advantage SBLC program. This amendment is an attack on veterans, rural, and low-income entrepreneurs, and it should be rejected resoundingly.

One of small businesses' greatest challenges is obtaining access to financial capital. For over a decade now, the Community Advantage program has been helping close this funding gap. Community Advantage lenders are required to make at least 60 percent of their loans to underserved markets defined as veteran-owned businesses, rural businesses, new businesses, businesses located in HUBZones, empowerment zones, and other low-income communities.

These are the types of businesses that too often find themselves on the margins. Their owners lack the ability to qualify for more traditional loans because they may lack a credit history or preexisting relationship with a bank.

What is unique about Community Advantage lenders is that they are mission-based, primarily nonprofits focused on economic and community development. They go beyond just providing loans. They provide technical assistance to the businesses they serve. As a result, Community Advantage has been far more successful than the traditional Small Business Administration 7(a) loan program at reaching underserved groups like veterans.

Community Advantage was operating as a pilot up until the SBA, just this past month, established the Community Advantage SBLC program to provide more permanency for the program and lenders.

Congress needs to build on these efforts by providing statutory permanency for Community Advantage so veteran, rural, and low-income small business owners can continue to be served. This amendment would do the

exact opposite, eradicating this proven program and undoing all our progress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's veterans, rural, and low-income entrepreneurs by rejecting this amendment.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is really irrelevant whether or not the program is doing good or not. They do not have the authority to make up their own rules and own programs without Congress.

It is as if they have left the band and the SBA is starting a solo career on their own. We are a team. We work together. The way it works is Congress is the one that enacts new programs to work with them.

Whether or not it is a good program is irrelevant. They do not have the authority.

Why have a Congress if all Federal agencies are just going to go out and do what they want?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who just happens to be the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of Congressman BEAN's amendment to H.R. 4664. Mr. BEAN's approach is non-controversial in ensuring government agencies do not overstep their authority.

Serving on both the Committee on Small Business and Education and the Workforce, Congressman BEAN is a passionate voice for our job-creators in Congress. I am grateful to serve with him.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I understand you say it is irrelevant whether it works or not. On my side I think we probably think it is relevant.

As the gentlewoman from California said, we think it is working. We think it is advantageous for small businesses. We think it is advantageous for minorities. We think it is advantageous for veterans. In that context, we think it is very relevant that it seems to work.

The gentleman who is the chair of the committee didn't say it didn't work, he just said they hadn't come to Congress. Now, if they don't have the authority to do that, then we ought to raise that issue. I am not sure that is the issue you are raising. I think that is the issue you were raising.

The fact of the matter is, fine, then let's have a hearing on it and begin. Let's have the authorizing committee that is responsible for this say this is not working or we think it is working and we ought to continue it. Absent a vote on continuing it, then one could draw the conclusion that Congress withdraws its approval of it.

I think by simply doing this, Members are going to be voting, in effect, blind on a program that we on this side think is working for the people that it needs to help.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that we reject this amendment.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his interest. The issue is one thing. The issue is: Does this agency or any agency have the ability to go out on their own on a solo career and not have congressional oversight? I say no. I say no.

We can talk about the program in the cloakroom or in the fireplace room and talk about how great it is. Hopefully, we will see eye-to-eye that Federal agencies that don't have the authority to go in a particular direction shouldn't go in that particular direction.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, my point is we have the right to oversight. The gentleman has the right to call them to come and testify and call others to testify on whether this program works or doesn't. We haven't given up that authority of oversight, as the gentleman refers to. I think we ought to exercise that.

□ 1245

What I don't think we ought to do is eliminate a program that apparently works on behalf of people I think all of us want to help.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my straightforward amendment that prohibits funds within this act from being used in violation of Federal immigration law for sanctuary city policies.

The concept of sanctuary city policies directly violate the rule of law. Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters. A nation of laws must enforce established laws and not seek ways to circumvent them. These sanctuary cities are disregarding Federal statutes by harboring thousands of illegal immigrants and providing a safe haven for violent criminals.

My amendment prohibits the use of funds that are appropriated by this act from being used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

This Federal law prohibits sanctuary policies that obstruct law enforcement officials from sharing information regarding a person's immigration status within the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

More than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions across the country have established policies that directly violate the law and shield criminal illegal aliens from enforcement.

There is a complete and total invasion taking place at our southern border due to the Biden administration and the left's radical open border agenda.

Since Biden has taken office, Border Patrol has encountered more than 6.3 million illegal aliens who have illegally entered America, released nearly 2.9 illegal aliens into our communities, and let more than 1.7 million known got-aways evade Border Patrol and enter the country with no record or knowledge of who these people are.

The number of illegal aliens who have entered the interior of the United States under the Biden administration now is greater than the population of at least 22 States, as well as Washington, D.C.

It is not just illegal immigrants coming across the southern border, but enough fentanyl to kill every American 15 times over. This drug, mostly imported from China and continuously smuggled through our southern border, is killing children and destroying families throughout the country.

Equally concerning is that in the last fiscal year alone, the FBI stopped more than 172 illegals on the terrorist watch list. Our porous southern border is literally a major national security risk.

These open borders and sanctuary city policies are destroying America. Cities like Chicago, Denver, Houston, Los Angeles, and New York have continued to beg the Federal Government for more money to handle the unprecedented influx of illegal aliens rather than changing their illegal alien policies that have exacerbated the problem.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and the committee for their work on this bill. I respectfully ask that my colleagues join me in support of the rule of law by voting in favor of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise in perplexion which I presume is objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I ask the gentlewoman to yield for a question.

Ms. BOEBERT. It is not my time.

Mr. HOYER. I ask you to yield.

Ms. BOEBERT. I have reserved. You are free to speak.

Mr. HOYER. I am asking if you will yield for a question.

Ms. BOEBERT. Sure. Ask your question.

Mr. HOYER. What funds in this bill are used for the purposes you are opposed to?

Ms. BOEBERT. I am sorry. I couldn't hear the gentleman. I was getting clarification.

This is precautionary.

Mr. HOYER. Precautionary for what? I am asking—

Ms. BOEBERT. There are sanctuary city policies that are in place that are allowing the refuge of illegal aliens into these cities, and there is an influx in crime and drugs into these cities.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that.

Ms. BOEBERT. There is no way for these folks to even report what is taking place because they are protected under this fake policy that has been created that is subduing the actual rule of law that we have in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that, but what you have said is that none of the funds in this bill can be spent for that objective.

Ms. BOEBERT. That is precautionary.

Mr. HOYER. What funds are in this bill to be spent for that objective?

Ms. BOEBERT. I have seen this administration use all sorts of funds to protect illegal aliens, and this is precautionary to ensure that it will not be used.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Ms. Boebert. There are no funds in this bill to do that, so this is just an opportunity for you to stand and perhaps speak about an important subject. I understand that. Nevertheless, there are no funds in this bill to accomplish that objective.

You don't believe the chairman would put funds in to accomplish that objective, do you?

I yield.

Mrs. BOEBERT. I do not trust this administration with any of the taxpayer funding that they are handling. They are mishandling our taxpayer funds.

If the gentleman says that there are no funds and agrees that this is precautionary, then I would urge that you support this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Do you understand if we do this amendment, then any subject that anybody has an interest in would be subject to such an amendment?

Now, the Rules Committee has waived points of order contrary to

what they said they wanted done when we were in charge because then they didn't want points of order so they could raise them.

There are no funds in this bill, Mr. Chair, for the objective that the gentlewoman wants to prevent.

I guarantee you Chairman WOMACK would not have included any funds to protect such activity.

I know him, and I know he feels strongly about this.

This amendment has no place in this bill because there is no money in this bill. You can argue about sanctuary cities, you can argue about the border, and you can do all of that, but this is not the bill to do it on.

This raises, therefore, a suspicion that somehow there is money in this bill that Mr. WOMACK would have put in or that I would have sanctioned to accomplish that objective.

That is simply not true, Mr. Chairman, and this has no place in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to direct all remarks to the Chair, and to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to state one more time that the White House has had a reputation of spending funds to protect illegal aliens who have broken our Nation's laws to illegally enter our country. I want to make very clear in this financial services bill that these funds cannot be allocated in that way.

If we don't put the cuffs on this administration somewhere, they will continue to go rogue and waste the taxpayer dollars that are being brought in by the hardworking Americans to fund these services for illegal aliens and to protect them in these sanctuary cities.

I am putting the handcuffs on the Biden administration with this commonsense amendment. If the gentleman, as I said, agrees that there are no funds, then there should be no problem to say we cannot allocate funds to protect these sanctuary cities and these illegal aliens.

Mr. Chair, I have spoken my piece on this amendment. I am prepared to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the gentlewoman has said that I have said that there are no funds. There are no funds. Nevertheless, she said that because of this amendment, she is going to handcuff the administration.

You can't handcuff the administration prohibiting funds that don't exist.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. BOEBERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriation Act for fiscal year 2024 to prohibit performance awards or bonuses for Senior Executive Service employees at the IRS.

Joe Biden has weaponized the Internal Revenue Service against the American people. He started off with a Big Brother proposal directing the IRS to snoop on the American people's bank accounts to monitor transactions of \$600 or more. He then spent \$80 billion to build an army of 87,000 armed IRS agents to target middle- and low-income families and small businesses with a flood of audits and draconian enforcement activities.

It is clear the IRS has long lost its touch with its mission, which is to serve taxpayers. American families don't need more audits and red tape. My amendment helps return the IRS to its original mission and ensure hard-working taxpayers receive satisfactory customer service without having to fear a supercharged IRS.

We need to protect the taxpayers, rein in an unaccountable Federal agency, and reverse course from this dangerous path of growing bureaucracy and heavy-handed Federal Government.

I have a message to all of my colleagues here today: If you disapprove of the IRS leaking tax information about the President's political opponents, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of the IRS targeting conservative groups for their political beliefs, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of the IRS ignoring congressional subpoenas, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of this agency stonewalling Congress, destroying evidence, and lying to the American people, then support my amendment.

Finally, if you disapprove of IRS senior executives receiving bonuses for their work, then support my amendment.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, it is so sad to hear on this floor assumptions made that have little or no basis in truth. It is so sad to hear a debate that if you are for or against something that is awful, then you are going to be against giving people who perform their services in extraordinary ways recognition of that as the private sector does all the time.

It is so sad to hear representation that we are eliminating gas stoves that we heard during the course of this debate on this bill, not in this instant debate, because it is totally untrue, and it is defaming.

Now, luckily, for Members of Congress, we are essentially constitutionally protected from defaming people. We can do that in the course of our business on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Nonetheless, it is sad that some of us do it. It is sad that some of us demean people who are performing an outstanding and absolutely essential service for the United States Government, for the people of this country, and to carry out the duties that we give them.

This assertion of this army of 87,000 people, armed guards at everybody's door, has been repeated, I think, probably one million times over the last 2 years or year and a half.

□ 1300

It is not true, and they know it is not true, but they don't care whether it is true. They believe that the constant assertion through social media and other means becomes fact for people who do not know the facts. How sad that we have come to this point.

I say we have come to the point, but we have been at that point for probably a long period of time, where people assert things that are not true but do it over and over again. We had a President of the United States who did that, and because he did assert it, they believed it.

Then along comes their chief of staff, and says: We know it wasn't true, but we kept telling the American people until they believed it. They believed it so much that they perpetrated an insurrection and tried to overthrow the legitimate course and duty of the Congress of the United States.

This amendment ought to be rejected because it is irrational to say that, in our enterprise, if you do outstanding work, do what we ask you to do, and do it effectively, we are not going to recognize the fact that you did outstanding service because you are an IRS agent or an IRS executive.

The IRS is the biggest agency in this Treasury Department and in this bill, and it is the basis of which all other agencies and departments operate because that is where the revenue comes from. The revenue comes from that as

well to pay the debt when we don't have enough dollars to do what we have asked them to do.

I hope that we would not continue to defame and demote—maybe my hope is misplaced—as we reduce Federal employees one after another over and over to \$1 in salary because we don't like what they do and don't like the policies they pursue for the administration.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chair, I have never been more thrilled to be a part of the Republican Party. I would much rather stand with the American people than stand in this Chamber and defend 87,000 armed IRS agents.

I have seen the recruiting requirements that say you must carry a firearm and be prepared to use deadly force. This amendment is straightforward, saying we don't want to give more money to IRS agents. We do not want to give bonuses to IRS agents who target conservative groups, who release tax information about the President's political opponents, or who ignore congressional subpoenas.

We have had IRS whistleblowers before the Oversight Committee who said that they were told that they must protect Joe Biden's son. That is why they became whistleblowers. They said enough is enough. We are here for justice. We want what is fair. We are not supporting a particular party. They saw the rot within the IRS and came forward.

I am proud to stand with the American people and say that we should not issue bonuses to IRS agents.

Taxation is theft, and arming 87,000 IRS agents to go after the hardworking middle class is just flatout armed robbery.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. BURCHETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Gary Gensler, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is very simple. It deals with a man named Gary Gensler, who is the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He has been implementing woke policies and abusing the rulemaking process.

One of the Security and Exchange Commission's primary responsibilities is to protect investors. However, rather than implementing rules to protect and grow investments, which he is supposed to do, Mr. Chair, Gensler is focusing on catering to the leftwing mob. He is forcing companies to prioritize Green New Deal-style climate initiatives and diversity quotas over the interests of investors.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, Chairman Gensler abuses the rulemaking process, for which he has been called on the carpet by both parties. He continues to put forward many highly controversial rules with little time for public comments. During the last Congress, Republicans and Democrats both expressed their concerns, as I mentioned, regarding Gensler's habit of proposing rules without allowing adequate time for public comment.

Biden's Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed nearly twice as many rules as the Trump administration had proposed in the same timeframe. This drastic increase under Gensler's leadership demonstrates where his real priorities lie, Mr. Chair. He is more committed to pushing political agendas on publicly traded companies, which he has no business doing, than performing his official duties as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Chairman Gensler's insistence on corrupting the rulemaking process to further the Biden administration's radical agenda at the expense of investors contradicts his duties as Chairman of the SEC.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment in the Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill that reduces Chairman Gensler's salary to \$1.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, there have been over 55 of these amendments. There have been some passed on voice vote. Every one put on the roll has lost, and this one will lose.

It is a nonserious amendment and not offered as a serious effort to legislate as so many requested be done, which is why they wanted so many amendments.

These are not serious amendments, and I oppose them.

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my friend and mentor.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

To be clear, I have a record throughout this entire appropriations process that will demonstrate that I am not a supporter writ large of the Holman rule. I personally think it has been overused, and the record can reflect that I don't think I am on the record voting for any of the Holman rules to date. I wanted to make that disclosure up front, but that is just a personal opinion. That is what I believe.

The Holman rule is a serious tool in Congress, and I think we have to be careful when we are establishing precedents on the use of it, but I do think there are times when the Holman rule is justified. Unfortunately, in my opinion, the Securities and Exchange Commission under Chairman Gary Gensler is an example of a time when I think the Holman rule can be used as a messenger to the SEC Chairman.

The health and vibrancy of our markets and our economy at large can be tested by an aggressive and overzealous rulemaking agenda. Over the last 3 years, that has defined the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Let me be clear: This is not just about how the regulatory process is conducted. The weight of the issues and topics under review by Chairman Gensler must be considered thoughtfully and comprehensively. Unfortunately, they have not been.

Reckless rulemaking requires climate disclosures from not only public companies that the SEC claims but also the private suppliers far downstream from these public companies.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 45 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, in the interest of time, this list goes on and on, to the tune of about 50 proposed and finalized rules by Chairman Gensler, a breakneck speed of rulemaking given that he has been Chairman for 3 years.

To me, it is unacceptable, and we have had that dialogue in hearings. Speed and volume should not be defining characteristics of the rulemaking process.

Mr. Chair, I stand with the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from South Carolina, the authors of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I support the Holman rule in this particular case.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend and mentor, the gentleman from Arkansas, for his friendship. When I first got here, he was probably one of the most influential people in my life on this floor, so I thank him for that, and I thank him for his support of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MRS. CAMMACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to finalize any rule or regulation that meets the definition of section 804(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would restrict funds at Federal agencies falling under the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act from being used to finalize any rule or regulation that would have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more.

The Biden administration has continually hamstrung the American people with agency rules that circumvent congressional oversight. Agencies like the SEC and CFPB do nothing to combat the hundreds of billions of dollars in regulatory costs that our constituents have been faced with since President Biden took office. In fact, they perpetuate them.

Unreasonable regulations relating to climate and ESG disclosure requirements, as well as aggressive and abusive IRS enforcement measures, are examples of hurdles that our financial agencies place upon everyday Americans.

My amendment seeks to prevent these types of abuses from these agencies before finalizing major rules or regulations, which often involve major policy decisions that should be decided by Congress' elected officials, not unelected bureaucrats.

□ 1315

By including my amendment in this bill, we restore Congress' Article I authority by preventing agencies from imposing rules behind closed doors. Instead, we commit ourselves to the way the process is intended—transparent, open governance in Congress, in the people's House.

For example, under Chairman Gary Gensler, the SEC has bombarded the fi-

nancial sector with more rules and regulatory proposals than any other predecessor since the 2008 global financial crisis. The SEC has put forward a total of 47 proposals that substantially affect financial markets since Gensler took the chair. In fact, these 47 proposals all have \$100 million more of industry impact apiece.

According to the Financial Times, the current SEC stands out for their number of proposals that are not mandated by congressional legislation. Just 17 percent of Gensler's SEC proposals were required under the Dodd-Frank Financial Reform Act, meaning that the majority of the SEC's proposals may not be necessary, let alone constitutional. This regulatory regime is the quintessential example of executive overreach. As The Wall Street Journal editorial board puts it: If it moves, the SEC will regulate it.

Specifically, the SEC's predictive analytics rule and climate disclosure rule are perfect examples of costly, misguided agency regulations. The predictive analytics rule seeks to prohibit certain technologies that investment firms and advisers use to automatically inform investors about financial news. Under this rule, companies who offer accessible, zero-commission trading would be hamstrung by compliance costs that favor firms with larger investment operations.

Speaking of compliance costs, the SEC rule of climate-related disclosure requirements would litter public companies and financial disclosures and institutions with unnecessary reporting requirements. Banks and companies would have to disclose greenhouse gas emissions and conjure up plans to mitigate these climate-related risks. Like many other Federal agency rules, there is no clear legal basis for these requirements, as they are meant to ultimately advance a political agenda rather than the will of the people.

It is simple. Congress should have oversight of these burdensome rules and regulations. We should have an open and transparent process. The great thing about this amendment is it is bipartisan. This same language was passed earlier this year on this very floor.

Let's reassert Article I authority. Let's make Congress accountable, open, transparent, and take the power back from this overreach.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, this amendment will block all major rulemaking by the administration. That is not a policy that we ought to adopt. It would be challenging at best and harmful at worst to our country, our economy, and our people. I urge its rejection. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I greatly respect my colleague on the other side

of the aisle, but I am not quite sure why he is thinking that this would be harmful to put more power in the hands of the people's elected Representatives.

In fact, this would encourage transparency. This would encourage Members of Congress to do the work that we are hired to do rather than unelected, nameless, faceless bureaucrats in a basement somewhere in Washington. I think it is critically important that we reassert our authority as prescribed by the Constitution.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the amendment by the gentlewoman from Florida to ensure that Congress is conducting the proper oversight of the executive branch.

This amendment mirrors the REINS Act, of which I am a proud original co-sponsor. This bill passed in the House earlier this year with overwhelming support. It is clear that the American people believe the overreach by the executive branch must come to an end.

There are over 2.1 million bureaucrats and not nearly enough transparency into the rulemaking process. This amendment appropriately defines a major rule so that more attention is put into a rule or regulation that has an effect on the economy.

It is our constitutional duty to keep the executive branch accountable, and that is exactly what this amendment does. Checks and balances must be reasserted, and we must stop wasteful spending. The American people do not want bureaucrats making impactful decisions when they are struggling to afford everyday items. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the reason I am opposed to this is not because I am opposed to making regulations more clear, less burdensome, and less undermining of economic development.

The reason I am opposed to this amendment is because it is a blanket amendment across the board. That I think is harmful to the administration of government by any administration, Republican or Democrat, no matter how many or how few those regulations may be if they make a determination that regulation is necessary.

I appreciate the gentlewoman saying we ought to do our work. This Congress is not doing that very well, of course. They had trouble electing a Speaker, had trouble electing a second Speaker, and they are having trouble passing appropriations bills. Somebody has got to sometimes act. We are not doing a very good job of that, and we ought not to

preclude across the board an administration from doing any major rule-making. I think that is a mistake, and I urge opposition to this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the salary or expenses of any officer or employee of the Office of the Vice President.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits any funding from being used by the Office of the Vice President for salaries and other expenses.

KAMALA HARRIS has been a failure as Vice President, from her inability to manage her team effectively, leading to high turnover, to her disastrous job as border czar, where she has failed to secure anything.

Let's look at the numbers. Since the Biden-Harris administration took office, there have been over 6.2 million illegal crossings of our southern border. In September alone, there were 269,735 illegal immigrants encountered at the southern border. That is an increase of over 300 percent since September of 2020.

Customs and Border Protection has seized over 27,000 pounds of fentanyl just in FY23.

There have been 169 people whose names were on the terrorist list stopped while trying to cross the border.

Cartels are making more than \$13 billion a year from smuggling people across our border.

The Biden-Harris far-left border policies are to blame for this crisis.

What has this border czar done about it? Nothing. The only thing our Vice President has succeeded at is failing us.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I hope the chairman will also be in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, there are a lot of Vice Presidents I haven't agreed with. I would never have contemplated offering, Mr. Chairman, an amendment to strike their ability to carry out the duties to which they were elected by the American people any more than I would suggest a Member of Congress that doesn't perform very well or very efficiently or very effectively have their offices defunded. They were elected by the people. They are entitled to the resources to carry out those duties and responsibilities given to them by the American people.

I hope this amendment is overwhelmingly rejected. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I think that the facts speak for themselves on our border czar, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the chairman of our committee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my ranking member for yielding. With all due respect to my colleague, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This bill funded the Office of the Vice President at a 20 percent cut from last year, so we have taken steps to send that message, that power of the purse message to the Office of the Vice President. This amendment would completely eliminate funding for the salary and expenses of any employee in the office.

Now, I agree that the Biden administration is pursuing an agenda that is in conflict with what I believe, there is no question about that.

However, I think it is wrong for us to take our grievances out by just carte blanche eliminating funding for the Office of the Vice President of the United States. Now, that is just a bridge too far, as far as I am concerned.

We need to have these debates about whether or not border security is correct or, you know, pick from the menu of all of the various things that divide Republicans and Democrats. But to go this far, I would strongly encourage the House of Representatives to take a very sober view of an amendment like this and understand that these kinds of things cut both ways.

I would caution us not to enter into the territory where because of an issue that we might have some disagreement on that we find it within our ability or the course of action to just eliminate the funding for the Office of the Vice President. I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I am going to tell you something. I am a businessman. The one problem in this country is that southern border down there is wide open. We have folks flooding across that place. We have hot spots all over the world. We have al-

ready announced how many terrorists from the watch list we have caught down there.

As a businessman, I look at that and I say, who is in charge of that? That is Vice President KAMALA HARRIS. If you can't change out who is in charge of it, then it is our duty as Representatives to make sure that she doesn't get paid for not doing her job. The American people should no longer be on the hook for Vice President HARRIS' failures.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act, including titles IV and VIII, may be used to support an increase in the weight of the Chinese renminbi in the Special Drawing Rights basket of the International Monetary Fund.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, we rightly recognize one of the chief rivals to the United States is China. Really, more specifically, the Chinese Communist Party that has a grip on power over the people of China, and one of the key tools for their power is their currency.

The amendment I am offering today would limit the Treasury's ability to go along with an organization we helped to create, the International Monetary Fund. The International Monetary Fund is supposed to support financial stability in the world. Part of the way they do that is with something called special drawing rights.

□ 1330

This is a basket of currencies that they extend to others, and they added the Chinese RMB. In 2016, they officially joined the IMF's elite basket of currencies, which determines the value of the IMF's Special Drawing Rights.

Special Drawing Rights are not only a reserve asset in central banks around the world, they also serve as a unit of account for the IMF.

The IMF's decision was something of a coup for Beijing as the RMB now sits in this exclusive club with only the dollar, the euro, the pound sterling, and the yen.

I believe the IMF's elevation of the RMB was premature at the time. China lacked rule of law, as it still does today. Nevertheless, the IMF thought validating Beijing anyway would somehow encourage their government to pursue reform and work within the international community.

None of this has come to pass, of course. China went on to assault Hong Kong's democracy. They have increased state control of their economy. They threaten Taiwan actively. They act as a lifeline to Putin's regime in Russia, and they are actively carrying out a genocide against Uyghurs in their own country.

Rather than look at these facts, the IMF chose last year to not only have the RMB in the Special Drawing Rights basket but to increase its weight from 10.92 percent to 12.28 percent, making it the third-most prominent currency in the basket behind the dollar and the euro.

Even leaving aside China's aggression at home and abroad, the IMF undertook this move despite China's lack of an independent central bank and a free-floating currency, as well as China's nontransparent policies for their exchange rate management.

I want to highlight this point. The CCP controls China's currency management and monetary policy, and the value and interest rates of the Special Drawing Rights are influenced by that now.

In turn, the Special Drawing Rights interest rate helps determine the borrowing costs for IMF member countries, and that rate should be based on transparent economic governance, not black box deliberations of the Chinese Communist Party.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. My amendment would prohibit the Treasury Secretary from supporting an increase in the RMB's weight in the Special Drawing Rights currency basket.

A similar initiative, the Chinese Currency Accountability Act, passed the Financial Services Committee unanimously in February. This amendment aligns our appropriations with our authorizing committee.

While I remain baffled as to why Treasury would have allowed the RMB to enter the Special Drawing Rights currency basket in the first place and certainly to increase its weight, we must prevent this bad situation from getting worse, and that is what this amendment does.

I urge all of our colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to articulate the Treasury's position.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, their response to this amendment is at first, it is unnecessary as the IMF executive board will not review the SDR basket during this U.S. fiscal year, so this will not have an impact on this fiscal year.

Moreover, Treasury says while we agree with the goal of this amendment to limit the internationalization of the RMB, we believe that it is important to retain some flexibility over the composition of the SDR basket so that we can incentivize China to improve its behavior in the international monetary system, including with respect to its foreign exchange practices.

Treasury then says we will continue to urge the IMF to push countries with SDR basket currencies to adhere to the highest levels of transparency and to correct deficiencies or inaccuracies in their reported data.

Essentially, they believe, A, it is unnecessary at this time; and, B, that it will not be considered during this fiscal year. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to receive the update that the administration doesn't anticipate changing it, but let's be clear.

That doesn't prohibit them having flexibility. They can actively work to decrease the weight of the RMB. They simply can't work to increase it. Since they say that is their stated policy goal, I think it provides them exactly what they need.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment. It checks the power and growth of the influence of the Chinese Communist Party and their currency, the RMB. It should not grow in its influence. That is what this amendment could help accomplish.

I urge all our colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out an enforcement action related to a crypto asset transaction.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman

from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chair, regulation by enforcement is a practice all too common with this administration. This is particularly the case at the SEC and Chair Gary Gensler's approach toward our capital markets and financial services industry but especially with our emerging digital assets community.

My amendment seeks to put an end to Chair Gensler's pattern of regulatory abuse—a pattern that is crushing American innovation and capital formation—without undermining our ability to go after criminals and fraudsters.

Specifically, my amendment prohibits the SEC from using funds for enforcement activities related to digital asset transactions until Congress passes legislation that gives the SEC jurisdiction over this asset class. This will keep Chair Gensler—who has proven himself to be ineffective and incompetent—in check while Congress continues working to give this industry a chance to grow and develop right here in the United States.

Let's just look at the facts. Under Gensler's leadership, the SEC has pursued dozens of enforcement actions against the digital asset industry, despite never finalizing a single rule or regulation for the industry to follow. Chair Gensler refuses to provide the marketplace with clear criteria for digital assets that he would consider to be a security. How can this industry comply if there are no rules or guidelines to follow?

On top of that, Chair Gensler has developed a track record of going after actors like Coinbase, a publicly traded company desperately trying to survive and innovate right here in the United States instead of going offshore like so many are forced to do. Gensler has done this while missing the bad actors, like FTX and Terra Luna.

At a time when clear guidance is desperately needed, Chair Gensler instead spends taxpayer resources praising himself for targeting celebrities like Kim Kardashian while Sam Bankman-Fried was running a Ponzi scheme right under his nose.

What is worse is the SEC doesn't even have jurisdiction from Congress over this asset class to begin with. Yet, the SEC has no shame in trying to expand their jurisdiction to swallow and destroy the digital assets industry through regulation by enforcement.

Last year, the SEC's director of enforcement admitted during a House Financial Services Committee hearing that the SEC pursues enforcement actions on entities that are actually outside of its jurisdiction. One of these extra-jurisdictional enforcement cases was the SEC's landmark crypto enforcement case against Ripple alleging that XRP is a security. In July, the Southern District of New York sided

against the SEC, asserting that XRP is not itself a security.

In August, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit found the SEC to be acting arbitrarily and capriciously in its refusal to approve Grayscale's Bitcoin spot ETF application. Just last month, the Government Accountability Office found the SEC to have created an illegal crypto accounting rule that is actually out of compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act and the Congressional Review Act.

The unique characteristics of digital assets make it hard to fit this asset class into any existing regulatory framework. That doesn't mean crypto is up for grabs by whatever Federal bureaucratic agency has the most taxpayer-funded enforcement resources to burn. Congress is working on legislation to establish a framework for how we classify specific digital assets, as a security or a commodity, which will dictate the regulator of jurisdiction.

Importantly, while Congress works to pass this necessary legislation, my amendment will not prevent future bad actors like FTX from being pursued and punished to the fullest extent of the law. The Department of Justice, Treasury, and the Office of Foreign Asset Control all have existing and sufficient authority to prosecute criminal acts of fraud, abuse, tax, or sanctions evasion. Some would even argue that these entities have done a better job of attacking fraud and criminal activity in this space than Gary Gensler and the SEC.

This amendment is designed to send an important signal not just to the SEC but to every regulatory entity in the Federal Government. Congress will hold unelected bureaucrats accountable. SEC Chair Gensler cannot continue to abuse the powers of his agency to fulfill a political agenda of driving the new and promising digital asset industry offshore. Congress must be allowed to finish its legislative work so the future of digital asset innovation is determined by Americans, not by unelected bureaucrats in December.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, however, that we are doing financial services business in this bill, and we are the Financial Services Committee to fund regulatory agencies.

To that extent, I understand its relevance. I must say that it is going to be difficult for Members who haven't seen this process by the Financial Services Committee to fully understand the ramifications of the proposal, and I think that is unfortunate.

Having said that, I also believe, again from a nonmember of the committee, that this cryptocurrency and crypto financial instruments certainly need to

be looked at and are being looked at on both sides of the Congress to ensure that Bankman-Fried actions don't happen to defraud a lot of people.

I really think what will happen here is when we go to conference, assuming we go to conference, that this is going to be looked at. We are going to hear from Treasury on it and also, obviously, the SEC, to see where we ought to land on this issue of no funds to carry out, I presume, any enforcement action related to crypto asset transactions.

I understand the gentleman's comment that there are at least three other agencies that would have the ability to move.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the best thing to do—this amendment, obviously, is going to move forward, and I'm going to urge both SEC and Treasury and the administration to look at it as it moves through conference.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate our friend from Maryland and his comments, and I do want to point out that he is absolutely correct.

The concerns here are bipartisan concerns. This is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is an issue about the digital asset space in this country. The whole purpose of this amendment is to try and stop what we—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I urge support.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MRS. FISCHBACH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for regulating or requiring the disclosure of information or data with respect to scope 3 emissions (as defined in the proposed rule titled "The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors" published by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the Federal Register on April 11, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 21334)) of producers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

□ 1345

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to prohibit

funds from being used by the SEC to regulate or require the disclosure of data regarding agricultural emissions.

Mr. Chairman, the SEC under Chair Gensler has been marked by a radical and tyrannical enforcement agenda that stretches the bounds of the SEC's jurisdiction and buries hardworking men and women in bureaucratic busywork.

Look no further than the SEC's climate-related disclosure rule, which would require public companies to disclose the emissions data of their supply chains. For food companies and agribusinesses that rely on farmers and ranchers, that means collecting emissions data at the farm level.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman, the SEC has no authority to regulate farmers and ranchers. Yet, that is exactly what the Chair is attempting to do.

The SEC is charged with protecting investors and facilitating financial market activity, not policing the tens of thousands of family farms in my district. Yet, the proposed rule would burden my constituents with mountains of paperwork and regulatory burdens if they want to do business with a public company.

These are farmers that, unlike their publicly traded counterparts, do not have the compliance, legal, and scientific departments to satisfy the requirements under this rule.

Production agriculture is already regulated by the EPA, the USDA, and State and local governments. As a result, farmers and ranchers are climate champions, not villains. The last thing they need is more unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., who have never set foot on a farm telling them how to do their jobs.

Mr. Chair, this amendment eliminates the duplicative, unnecessary, burdensome, and ultimately inappropriate regulatory effort and allows farmers in my district and throughout the country to do what they do best: feed and fuel the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, section 550 of the bill seems to do the same thing.

Reading from the bill itself, it says: "None of the funds made available in this act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled 'The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors,' Federal reg, et cetera—"or any substantially similar rule."

Is that the same effect as this amendment?

Mr. WOMACK. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOMACK. It may be duplicative, but it is twice as nice, so we will proceed.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I will be half as articulate about it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is no issue in being duplicative and very clear on what we are trying to accomplish with this amendment because it is important to make sure that we are protecting the farmers, those people, like I said before, who feed and fuel the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I rise in support.

Plainly and simply, environmental policing is not within the SEC's scope. It is just not. I know this process that we have undergone this morning sounds a lot like we are ganging up on Gensler, and maybe we are, and for good reason.

Scope 3 emissions are hard to quantify, requiring the shifting of information needed from outside partnering companies like family farmers. The information that would need to be reported to bigger companies the farmers rely on for business is overly burdensome.

Farmers are American heroes. They don't need any more negative input factors on how they feed, clothe, and fuel this Nation. They already have enough to deal with—high inflation, markets, weather.

Somebody has to stand up for the family farmer, and that is why I am proud to support my colleague from Minnesota's amendment here, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer needs an advocate, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, from what I understand, the chairman is saying that standing up twice is twice as good as standing up once.

Mr. Chair, let me say something about my friend Mr. Gensler, whom I have known since he was a young boy. His father was a friend of mine when I was in the Maryland Senate. Chair Gensler is a good man. He has been in at least two administrations, at this point in time, doing an important job. Some people may differ with him, but he is an honest, hardworking, extraordinarily intelligent representative chosen by the administration to carry out their policies.

I would be negligent not to say that of somebody I have known so long and who I believe has great integrity, although he may have differences with people.

Mr. Chairman, we have already said this, but we are going to say it again.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Chairman, let me echo some of the things that the chairman said regarding protecting the farmers.

We have to protect the farmers. It is a national security issue. It is a food issue. It is a fuel issue.

It is important that we make sure that we get the legislation and the bills right, the language right, in order to protect them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Insurance Office to implement, administer, or enforce subsection (e)(6) of section 313 of title 31, United States Code. Additionally, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Office of Financial Research to implement, administer, or enforce section 5343(f) of title 12, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would repeal the subpoena authority of the Treasury's Federal Insurance Office. Additionally, it removes the subpoena authority of the Office of Financial Research.

For over 150 years, State insurance regulators and the law as passed by those State legislatures have regulated insurance companies, and it has worked out very well.

The Federal Insurance Office, FIO, created under Dodd-Frank, has grown increasingly aggressive in collecting data from insurance companies, most recently issuing a proposed data collection to assess "climate-related financial risk."

Despite working with State regulators on previous efforts, FIO intentionally chose not to collaborate with State regulators on this climate data call.

Not only has the office been unclear with how they intend to use the data they collect, but the effort would be duplicative in many ways as many States already collect a similar but

maybe not exact set of data, as required by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chair, any efforts by Treasury or FIO to sidestep State insurance regulators blatantly undermine congressional intent. That is why I introduced the Insurance Data Protection Act to repeal FIO's subpoena power. The amendment would have the same effect as the bill, and I am pleased many of my colleagues have supported that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this is another time when we retreat from oversight. We talk a lot about oversight on the Committee on Appropriations. We talk a lot about oversight in the authorizing committees, that we need to find out what the people are doing, what we asked them to do, that they are doing it properly, and that they are serving the American people as we want them to do.

The same is true, of course, of those folks who serve in the regulatory agencies, Treasury and others, to make sure that the consumers are being treated fairly. I don't know why we keep re-treating from that.

If they do wrong, we ought to call them out for doing that. If they are doing too much, we ought to call them out for doing too much. To say that they can't do it undermines the consumer and undermines the American people who are expecting us to make sure that people are treating them fairly, on the up and up, and not taking advantage of them, not because they are not smart, because they are, but they may not be expert on what they are dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I once again say that State regulators have done a wonderful job in this area for many years, and I think they should continue to be the focus of any of this data collection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 902. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any rule defining or describing unfair methods of competition for purposes of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds being made available to the FTC from being used to issue any rule defining or describing unfair methods of competition for purposes of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The FTC has issued substantive rules concerning “unfair methods of competition,” UMC, as it is referred to in financial services, including a near-blanket ban on noncompete agreements.

Since Chair Khan has taken over, the FTC has become a partisan weapon to enact sweeping antitrust policy that expands agency power and discards decades of precedent. Chair Khan is basing this authority on tenuous legal ground that predates the major questions doctrine.

As the Supreme Court made clear in *West Virginia v. EPA*, an executive agency needs clear authorization from Congress to issue a regulation that has great “economic and political significance.”

Unfair competition rulemaking would be a claim of quasi-legislative power that would distract the agency from its core mission of case-by-case expert application of the FTC Act through administrative adjudication. It would also be inconsistent with the explicit grants of rulemaking authority that Congress has given the FTC on consumer protection issues.

This is not what they are looking for on competitive grounds. Allowing this much authority to the FTC, which oversees nearly all aspects of our economy, would open the door to significantly more harmful rules that would empower this administration to coerce companies to bow to what I consider to be a radical agenda.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, let me read the remarks of the Commission in response to this amendment. It says: The amendment would prevent the FTC from implementing, administering, or enforcing any rule it may promulgate pursuant to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that proposed a ban on employers imposing noncompete restrictions on workers.

Workers are locked in sometimes because they have no other option.

□ 1400

It then goes on to say that evidence shows that noncompete restrictions are reducing the competitiveness of labor markets and depriving businesses of a talent pool they need to enter, build, or expand. The FTC estimates that the proposed rule would increase workers’ total earnings by nearly \$300 billion per year, and about 30 million Americans are bound by a noncompete clause.

In other words, what the effect of this amendment would be is having 30 million workers get less pay because of the noncompete because they have no place to go.

We passed legislation on noncompetes, which have been used by businesses over time to trap their employees.

This amendment is so broad that it may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any rule defining or describing unfair methods of competition.

Why would we adopt an amendment that says the FTC cannot tell people about unfair competition? I can’t conceive of any Member wanting to say to the American public that we are not going to let them even tell you that there are unfair competitive practices going on.

That doesn’t seem to me to make common sense, and it certainly doesn’t make sense for employees.

I hope that we will defeat this amendment as way too broad and way too harmful to men and women in the workplace. I don’t know the figure, but the FTC says 30 million people, as much as \$300 billion in reduced wages—that is 30 million people, so that is a lot of people.

Mr. Chair, I urge that Congress, at this point in time, on this bill, not do this without much greater thought about the ramifications to 30 million people.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chair, my short answer would be because this is our job, not the Commission’s job. This is our job. That is the point of the amendment, to put the power back in the hands of Congress and not have these rogue agencies.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman’s amendment.

I agree that it is our job. The once measured, productive, and independent FTC has, in recent years, certainly under this administration and Chairwoman Khan, turned into an agency that has disposed of tested and proven operations and rulemakings.

Gone are the days of competition based on prices, products, and business innovation. Today, we have an FTC that is guided by political whims and I guess the overall notion that big has to be bad.

As a result, numerous rulemakings have raised serious questions for the

American people and American businesses of all sizes, which is especially true for rules developed under the FTC’s unfair methods of competition standard, which this amendment prohibits, including the ill-advised noncompete rulemaking.

I stand here today in support of my friend from Wisconsin’s amendment in order to rein in the Biden administration’s FTC by prohibiting section 5 actions and the suspension of the early termination to premerger notification filings.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for his thoughtful amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I think we all understand that the Chair of the FTC is a controversial figure. I get that. To draw a piece of legislation this broadly, I think, miserves the role that the Congress established the Commission to pursue.

We can certainly step in when there are abuses. This says any rule—good rule, bad rule, no rule. None of the funds to implement, administer, or enforce any rule, not the rule that is necessarily under consideration that we have been discussing, but any rule.

I think that is bad policy, and I think, as I have said, it is dangerous to the American worker and the American purchaser of goods. I think that we ought to hone in on the particular and not paint with such a broad brush that will cause harm to the ability of the agency to do what we set it up to do.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chair, I simply, once again, urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-269 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MOLINARO of New York.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 15 by Mrs. HARSHBARGER of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. BARR of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. BARR of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. BEAN of Florida.

Amendment No. 42 by Mr. BURCHETT of Tennessee.

Tokuda	Valadão	Watson Coleman	Spartz	Tiffany	Westerman	Vasquez	Wasserman	Williams (GA)
Tonko	Vargas	Wexton	Stauber	Timmons	Wilson (SC)	Veasey	Schultz	Williams (NY)
Torres (CA)	Vasquez	Wild	Steube	Van Duyne	Wittman	Velázquez	Waterson	Williams (TX)
Torres (NY)	Veasey	Williams (GA)	Strong	Waltz	Yakym	Wagner	Watson Coleman	Wilson (FL)
Trahan	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)	Tenney	Weber (TX)	Zinke	Walberg	Wexton	Womack
Trone	Wasserman	Womack	Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup			Wild	
Turner	Schultz							
Underwood	Waters							

NOT VOTING—13

Armstrong	Larsen (WA)	Pressley
Arrington	McCarthy	Salazar
Bishop (NC)	Morelle	Scalise
Gimenez	Norcross	
Jackson Lee	Phillips	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1442

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 18, printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 286, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 626]

AYES—140

Alford	Fitzgerald	Luetkemeyer	Chu	Kildee	Shakowsky	Aderholt	Dunn (FL)	Johnson (OH)
Allen	Foxx	Luna	Ciscomani	Kiley	Schiff	Alford	Edwards	Johnson (SD)
Arrington	Franklin, Scott	Luttrell	Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schneider	Allen	Elzey	Jordan
Babin	Fry	Malliotakis	Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)	Amodei	Emmer	Joyce (PA)
Banks	Fulcher	Mann	Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David	Armstrong	Estes	Kelly (MS)
Bean (FL)	Gaetz	Massie	Connolly	LaHood	Sewell	Arrington	Ezell	Kelly (PA)
Bentz	Gallagher	Mast	Correa	LaLota	Sherman	Babin	Fallon	Kustoff
Bergman	Good (VA)	McCarthy	Costa	Landsman	Sherrill	Balderson	Feeenstra	LaHood
Biggs	Gooden (TX)	McCaull	Courtney	Larson (CT)	Simpson	Banks	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Gosar	McClain	Craig	Latta	Slotkin	Barr	Finstad	Lamborn
Boebert	Granger	McClintock	Crockett	Lawler	Scanlon	Bean (FL)	Fitzgerald	Langworthy
Bost	Graves (LA)	McCormick	Crow	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)	Bentz	Flood	Latta
Brecheen	Graves (MO)	Miller (IL)	Castor (FL)	Lee (FL)	Smucker	Bergman	Foxx	LaTurner
Burchett	Green (TN)	Miller (OH)	Castro (TX)	Connolly	Sorensen	Biggs	Franklin, Scott	Lee (FL)
Burlison	Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)	D'Esposito	Correa	Soto	Bilirakis	Fry	Lesko
Cammack	Griffith	Mills	Davidson	Davids (KS)	Spanberger	Boebert	Fulcher	Letlow
Carey	Grothman	Mooney	Levin	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury	Bost	Gaetz	Luettkemeyer
Carl	Guest	Moore (AL)	Davis (IL)	Stanton	Brecheen	Brecheen	Gallagher	Massie
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	Moore (UT)	Davis (NC)	Lofgren	Steel	Carey	Luna	Mast
Cline	Hageman	Moran	Dean (PA)	Loudermilk	Stefanik	Buck	Gonzales, Tony	Mccaul
Cloud	Harris	Norman	DeGette	Lucas	Stiel	Bucshon	Good (VA)	McClain
Clyde	Harshbarger	Ogles	DeLauro	Lynch	Stevens	Burchett	Goodeen (TX)	McClintock
Collins	Hern	Owens	DeBene	Strickland	Burgess	Burgess	Gosar	Mann
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Palmer	Deluzio	Mace	Burlison	Granger	Graves (LA)	Massie
Crane	Houchin	Pence	DeSaulnier	Magaziner	Swalwell	Cammack	Graves (MO)	Mast
Crawford	Hudson	Perry	Diaz-Balart	Manning	Sykes	Graves (TN)	McCaull	McCaull
Crenshaw	Hunt	Pfluger	Dingell	Takano	Titus	Carl	Green (TN)	McClain
Curtis	Issa	Posey	Doggett	Dobkin	Tlalib	Thanedar	Carter (GA)	McClintock
De La Cruz	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)	Emmer	McCormick	Clyde	Chavez-DeRemer	Griffith	McCormick
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Rose	Escobar	McGarvey	Hageman	Cline	Grothman	McHenry
Donalds	Johnson (SD)	Rosendale	Eshoo	McGovern	Hageman	Cloud	McClintock	McHenry
Duarte	Jordan	Rouzer	Espaillat	McHenry	Collins	Guest	Meuser	Miller (IL)
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Roy	Dingell	Meeks	Tonko	Comer	Miller (OH)	Miller (OH)
Dunn (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Santos	Dobkin	Torres (CA)	Underwood	Crane	Harshbarger	Miller (WV)
Ellzey	Kustoff	Schweikert	Edwards	Menendez	Thompson (CA)	Hern	Hern	Miller-Meeks
Estes	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin	Fitzpatrick	Evans	Thompson (MS)	Torres (NY)	Crawford	Mills
Ezell	Lamborn	Self	Fleischmann	Meng	Trahan	Crenshaw	Hill	Moolenaar
Fallon	Langworthy	Sessions	Flood	Meuser	Trone	Curtis	Hinson	Mooney
Ferguson	LaTurner	Smith (MO)	Foster	Fletcher	Turner	Davidson	Houchin	Moore (AL)
Finstad	Lesko	Smith (NE)	Foushee	Miller-Meeks	Valdado	De La Cruz	Hudson	Moore (UT)
Fischbach	Letlow	Smith (NJ)	Frankel, Lois	Moulton	Van Drew	DesJarlais	Huizinga	Moran
					Van Orden	Donalds	Hunt	Moylan
					Vargas	Van Orden	Issa	Murphy
						Duncan	Jackson (TX)	Nehls

NOES—286

Bishop (NC)	Moore (WI)	Phillips
Gimenez	Morelle	Pressley
Jackson Lee	Nehls	Scalise
Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Webster (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR		
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).		
There is 1 minute remaining.		

□ 1446

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 21, printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 246, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 627]

AYES—183

Aderholt	Dunn (FL)	Johnson (OH)
Alford	Edwards	Johnson (SD)
Allen	Elzey	Jordan
Amodei	Emmer	Joyce (PA)
Armstrong	Estes	Kelly (MS)
Arrington	Ezell	Kelly (PA)
Babin	Fallon	Kustoff
Balderson	Feeenstra	LaHood
Banks	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Barr	Finstad	Lamborn
Bean (FL)	Barr	Fischbach
Bentz	Bean (FL)	Fitzgerald
Bergman	Bentz	Flood
Biggs	Bergman	LaTurner
Bilirakis	Foxx	Lee (FL)
Boebert	Biggs	Lesko
Bost	Bilirakis	Letlow
Brecheen	Balderson	Ferguson
Burchett	Banks	Finstad
Burlison	Barr	Fischbach
Cammack	Bean (FL)	Bean (FL)
Carey	Bentz	Flood
Carl	Bergman	Feeenstra
Carter (GA)	Biggs	Ferguson
Cline	Bilirakis	Finstad
Cloud	Balderson	Fischbach
Clyde	Banks	Finstad
Collins	Barr	Fischbach
Comer	Bilirakis	Fitzgerald
Crane	Balderson	Flood
Crawford	Banks	Finstad
Crenshaw	Barr	Fischbach
Curtis	Bilirakis	Fitzgerald
De La Cruz	Balderson	Flood
DesJarlais	Banks	Finstad
Donalds	Barr	Fischbach
Duarte	Bilirakis	Fitzgerald
Duncan	Balderson	Flood
Dunn (FL)	Banks	Finstad
Ellzey	Barr	Fischbach
Estes	Bilirakis	Fitzgerald
Ezell	Balderson	Flood
Fallon	Banks	Finstad
Ferguson	Balderson	Flood
Finstad	Banks	Finstad
Fischbach	Balderson	Flood

Moore (AL)	Rose	Tenney
Moore (UT)	Rosendale	Thompson (PA)
Moran	Rouzer	Tiffany
Moylan	Roy	Timmons
Murphy	Rutherford	Turner
Nehls	Salazar	Valadao
Newhouse	Santos	Van Drew
Norman	Schweikert	Van Duyne
Nunn (IA)	Scott, Austin	Van Orden
Obernolte	Self	Wagner
Ogles	Sessions	Walberg
Owens	Simpson	Waltz
Palmer	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Pence	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Perez	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Perry	Smucker	Westerman
Pfluger	Spartz	Williams (NY)
Posey	Stauber	Williams (TX)
Radewagen	Steel	Wilson (SC)
Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Wittman
Rodgers (WA)	Steil	Womack
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Yakym
Rogers (KY)	Strong	Zinke

NOES—210

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Pallone
Aguilar	Garcia, Robert	Panetta
Allred	Golden (ME)	Pappas
Auchincloss	Goldman (NY)	Pascarella
Balint	Gomez	Payne
Barragán	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Beatty	Vicente	Peltola
Bera	Gottheimer	Peters
Beyer	Green, Al (TX)	Petterson
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pingree
Blumenauer	Harder (CA)	Plaskett
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Pocan
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Porter
Bowman	Himes	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Horsford	Ramirez
Brown	Houlahan	Raskin
Brownley	Hoyer	Ross
Budzinski	Hoyle (OR)	Ruiz
Bush	Huffman	Ruppersberger
Caraveo	Ivey	Ryan
Carbajal	Jackson (IL)	Sablan
Cárdenas	Jackson (NC)	Salinas
Carson	Jacobs	Sánchez
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Sarbanes
Cartwright	Jeffries	Scanlon
Case	Johnson (GA)	Schakowsky
Casten	Kamlager-Dove	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Keating	Scholten
Chavez-DeRemer	Kelly (IL)	Schrier
Cherifilus-	Khanna	Scott (VA)
McCormick	Kildee	Scott, David
Chu	Kim (NJ)	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Sherrill
Cleaver	Landsman	Slotkin
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Correa	Lee (PA)	Stansbury
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Stanton
Courtney	Levin	Stevens
Craig	Lieu	Strickland
Crockett	Lofgren	Bilirakis
Crow	Lynch	Sykes
Cuellar	Magaziner	Takano
Davids (KS)	Manning	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Davis (NC)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Dean (PA)	McClellan	Titus
DeGette	McCollum	Tlaib
DeLauro	McGarvey	Tokuda
DelBene	McGovern	Tonko
Deluzio	Meeks	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Menendez	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Meng	Trahan
Doggett	Mfume	Trone
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Underwood
Eshoo	Moskowitz	Vargas
Espauillat	Moulton	Vasquez
Evans	Mrvan	Veasey
Fitzpatrick	Mullin	Velázquez
Fletcher	Nadler	Wasserman
Foster	Napolitano	Schultz
Foushee	Neal	Waters
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Frost	Nickel	Wexton
Gallego	Norton	Wild
Garamendi	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Omar	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (NC)	Larsen (WA)	Phillips
Gimenez	Morelle	Pressley
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1505

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. BEAN OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 39, printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 220, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 631]

AYES—205

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga	Casten	Keating
Alford	Donalds	Hunt	Castor (FL)	Schiff
Allen	Duncan	Issa	Castro (TX)	Schneider
Amodei	Dunn (FL)	Jackson (TX)	Chavez-Dekemer	Scholten
Armstrong	Edwards	Johnson (OH)	Cherifilus-	Schriner
Arrington	Ellzey	Johnson (SD)	McCormick	Scott (VA)
Babin	Emmer	Jordan	Chu	Scott, David
Bacon	Estes	Joyce (PA)	Clark (MA)	Sewell
Baird	Ezell	Kean (NJ)	Clarke (NY)	Sherman
Balderson	Fallon	Kelly (MS)	Cleaver	Sherrill
Banks	Feenstra	Kelly (PA)	Clyburn	Slotkin
Barr	Ferguson	Kiggans (VA)	Cohen	Smith (WA)
Bean (FL)	Finstad	Kim (CA)	Connolly	Sorensen
Bentz	Fischbach	Kustoff	Correa	Soto
Bergman	Fitzgerald	LaLota	Costa	Spanberger
Bice	Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Courtney	Stansbury
Biggs	Flood	Lamborn	Crockett	Stanton
Bilirakis	Foxx	Langworthy	Craig	Leger Fernandez
Bost	Fry	LaTurner	Cuellar	Strickland
Boebert	Franklin, Scott	Latta	Crow	Lieu
Born	Boehner	Lee (FL)	Crockett	Lofgren
Brennan	Brennan	Levitt	David (KS)	Lynch
Brock	Bridges	Lindsey	Davis (IL)	Sykes
Brown	Brown	Lofgren	Magaziner	Takano
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Malliotakis	Thanedar
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DePete	Thompson (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Mann	Thompson (MS)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Dingell	McGovern
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeGette	Meeks
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeLauro	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DelBene	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Lettrell	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGarvey	Tonko
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McCath	Titus
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	McClellan	Tlaib
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	Deluzio	McCollum
Brownley	Brown	Lopez	DeSaulnier	Tokuda

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (NC) Moore (UT) Pressley
 Gimenez Morelle Salazar
 Jackson Lee Norcross Scalise
 Larsen (WA) Phillips
 Miller (WV) Posey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1508

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 631, Bean of Florida amendment 39.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. BURCHETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 42, printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 252, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

AYES—175

Aderholt	Ellzey	Joyce (PA)
Alford	Emmer	Kelly (MS)
Allen	Estes	Kustoff
Armstrong	Ezell	LaHood
Arrington	Fallon	LaLota
Babin	Feenstra	LaMalfa
Baird	Ferguson	Lamborn
Balderson	Finstad	Langworthy
Banks	Fischbach	Latta
Barr	Fitzgerald	LaTurner
Bean (FL)	Foxx	Lee (FL)
Bentz	Franklin, Scott	Lesko
Bergman	Fry	Letlow
Bice	Fulcher	Loudermilk
Biggs	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Gallagher	Luna
Boebert	Garcia, Mike	Luttrell
Bost	Good (VA)	Mace
Brecheen	Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis
Buchanan	Gosar	Mann
Burchett	Granger	Massie
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Mast
Burlison	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Cammack	Green (TN)	McCaull
Carey	Greene (GA)	McClain
Carl	Grothman	McClintock
Carter (GA)	Guest	McCormick
Cline	Guthrie	McHenry
Cloud	Hageman	DeSaulnier
Clyde	Harris	Meuser
Collins	Harshbarger	Miller (IL)
Comer	Horn	Miller (OH)
Crane	Higgins (LA)	Miller-Meeks
Crawford	Hill	Mills
Crenshaw	Houchin	Molinaro
Davidson	Hudson	Moolenaar
De La Cruz	Huizenga	Mooney
DesJarlais	Hunt	Moore (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Issa	Murphy
Donalds	Jackson (TX)	Nehls
Duarte	Johnson (OH)	Norman
Duncan	Johnson (SD)	Ogles
Dunn (FL)	Jordan	Owens

Palmer
 Perry
 Pfleuger
 Posey
 Radewagen
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Santos
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Self

Sessions
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spatz
 Staber
 Stefanik
 Stell
 Steube
 Strong
 Tenney
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Van Drew
 Van Duyne

Van Orden
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams (NY)
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yakym

Vasquez
 Veasey
 Velazquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Bishop (NC)
 Jackson Lee
 Gimenez
 Larsen (WA)
 Griffith
 Hoyle (OR)
 Phillips
 Morelle
 Scalise
 Norcross
 Wilson (FL)
 Watson Coleman
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (NC)
 Jackson Lee
 Gimenez
 Larsen (WA)
 Griffith
 Hoyle (OR)
 Phillips
 Morelle
 Scalise
 Norcross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1512

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 44, printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 106, noes 322, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

AYES—106

Alford	Gooden (TX)	Miller (WV)
Arrington	Gosar	Mills
Babin	Graves (MO)	Mooney
Banks	Green (TN)	Moore (AL)
Barr	Greene (GA)	Moylan
Bean (FL)	Hageman	Nehls
Bergman	Harris	Norman
Biggs	Harshbarger	Ogles
Boebert	Hern	Palmer
Bost	Houchin	Perry
Burchett	Hudson	Pfluger
Burlison	Huizenga	Posey
Cammack	Hunt	Reschenthaler
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	
Cline	Jordan	
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Rosendale
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Collins	LaMalfa	Santos
Comer	Lamborn	Schweikert
Crane	LaTurner	Self
De La Cruz	Lesko	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Letlow	Spartz
Dunn (FL)	Loudermilk	Steube
Dunn (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Strong
Emmer	Mace	Tiffany
Estes	Malliotakis	Timmons
Finstad	McClain	Van Drew
Fitzgerald	McCormick	Van Duyne
Fry	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	Miller (OH)	Wittman

NOES—322

Adams	Auchincloss	Bentz
Aderholt	Bacon	Bera
Baird	Bard	Beyer
Balderson	Bilirakis	Bice
Ballint	Barragán	Bishop (GA)
Balderson	Bishop (GA)	Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester	Granger	Obernolte	Williams (GA)	Wilson (SC)	Zinke
Bonamici	Graves (LA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (NY)	Womack	
Bowman	Green, Al (TX)	Omar	Wilson (FL)	Yakym	
Boyle (PA)	Griffith	Owens			
Brecheen	Grijalva	Pallone			
Brown	Grothman	Panetta	Bishop (NC)	Larsen (WA)	Pressley
Brownley	Guest	Pappas	Gimenez	Morelle	Scalise
Buchanan	Guthrie	Pascrall	Hoyle (OR)	Norcross	
Buck	Harder (CA)	Payne	Jackson Lee	Phillips	
Bucshon	Hayes	Pelosi			
Budzinski	Higgins (LA)	Peltola			
Burgess	Higgins (NY)	Pence			
Bush	Hill	Perez			
Calvert	Himes	Peters			
Caraveo	Hinson	Pettersen			
Carbajal	Horsford	Pingree			
Cárdenas	Houlahan	Plaskett			
Carey	Hoyer	Pocan			
Carson	Huffman	Porter			
Carter (LA)	Issa	Quigley			
Carter (TX)	Ivey	Radewagen			
Cartwright	Jackson (IL)	Ramirez			
Casar	Jackson (NC)	Raskin			
Case	Jacobs	Rogers (AL)			
Casten	James	Rogers (KY)			
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Ross			
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Rouzer			
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz			
Cherifius- McCormick	Johnson (SD)	Ruppelberger			
Chu	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford			
Ciscomani	Kamlager-Dove	Ryan			
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Sablan			
Clarke (NY)	Kean (NJ)	Salazar			
Cleaver	Keating	Salinas			
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez			
Cohen	Kelly (PA)	Sarbanes			
Cole	Khanna	Scanlon			
Connolly	Kiagans (VA)	Schakowsky			
Correa	Kildee	Schiff			
Costa	Kiley	Schneider			
Courtney	Kilmer	Scholten			
Craig	Kim (CA)	Schrader			
Crawford	Kim (NJ)	Scott (VA)			
Crenshaw	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, Austin			
Crockett	Kuster	Scott, David			
Crow	Kustoff	Sessions			
Cuellar	LaHood	Sewell			
Curtis	LaLota	Sherman			
D'Esposito	Landsman	Sherrill			
Davids (KS)	Langworthy	Simpson			
Davidson	Larson (CT)	Slotkin			
Davis (IL)	Latta	Smith (NE)			
Davis (NC)	Lawler	Smith (NJ)			
Dean (PA)	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)			
DeGette	Lee (FL)	Smucker			
DeLauro	Lee (NV)	Sorensen			
DelBene	Lee (PA)	Soto			
Deluzio	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger			
DeSaulnier	Levin	Stansbury			
Diaz-Balart	Lieu	Stanton			
Dingell	LoFGREN	Stauber			
Doggett	Lucas	Steel			
Duarte	Luna	Stefanik			
Edwards	Lynch	Steil			
Ellzey	Magaziner	Stevens			
Escobar	Manning	Strickland			
Eshoo	Massie	Swallow			
Espalliat	Matsui	Sykes			
Evans	McBath	Takano			
Ezell	McCarthy	Tenney			
Feenstra	McClellan	Thanedar			
Ferguson	McClintock	Thompson (CA)			
Fitzpatrick	McCullum	Thompson (MS)			
Fleischmann	McGarvey	Thompson (PA)			
Fletcher	McGovern	Titus			
Flood	Meeks	Tlaib			
Foster	Menendez	Tokuda			
Foushee	Meng	Tonko			
Foxx	Meuser	Torres (CA)			
Frankel, Lois	Mifune	Torres (NY)			
Frost	Miller-Meeks	Trahan			
Fulcher	Molinaro	Trone			
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Turner			
Garcia (IL)	Moore (UT)	Underwood			
Garcia (TX)	Moore (WI)	Valadão			
Garcia, Mike	Moran	Vargas			
Garcia, Robert	Moskowitz	Vasquez			
Golden (ME)	Moulton	Veasey			
Goldman (NY)	Mrvan	Velázquez			
Gomez	Mullin	Wagner			
Gonzales, Tony	Murphy	Wasserman			
Gonzalez,	Nadler	Schultz			
Vicente	Napolitano	Waters			
González-Colón	Neal	Watson Coleman			
Gottheimer	Neguse	Webster (FL)			
	Newhouse	Wenstrup			
	Nickel	Westerman			
	Norton	Wexton			
	Nunn (IA)	Wild			

Williams (GA)
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Guest
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Jackson Lee

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1516

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR.

FITZGERALD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 902. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the November 10, 2022, “Policy Statement Regarding the Scope of Unfair Methods of Competition Under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, Commission File No. P221202”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the FTC from bringing cases under Section 5 that deviate from traditional antitrust statutes commonly known as the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Since the start of the administration, the FTC has taken several steps that stray from traditional procedures and norms while pushing the limit on statutory bounds Congress had already placed in this area.

The FTC act does not define “unfair methods of competition.” In 2015, the FTC issued the statement of enforcement principles that clarified the priority of consumer welfare in the application of the antitrust laws through the FTC Act.

In particular, it has confined its Section 5 cases to conduct that diminishes consumer welfare by harming competition or the competitive process as opposed to conduct that merely harms individual competitors or poses public policy concerns unrelated to competition.

The 2015 statement was replaced by an ambiguous new statement in November of 2022 that causes confusion and strays from the rule of law.

Rather than promoting competition, the FTC is imposing more costs on businesses, driving up prices for consumers that simply pile onto inflation.

If the FTC and the unaccountable bureaucrats at other agencies such as the

FDIC continue to stray from the rule of law, Americans will face higher prices, less innovation, and reductions in quality as these agencies seek unchecked authority to regulate and micromanage the American economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would prevent the FTC from implementing its policy statement explaining the scope of the commission’s authority over unfair methods of competition.

It will create confusion and legal uncertainty in cases in which the FTC seeks to use this authority to stop unfair methods of competition that hurts consumers, honest small businesses, and workers.

The November 2022 policy statement informs the public, business community, and antitrust bar how the agency interprets the law based on principles from prior case law and agency.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that is the issue, that there is more confusion now that the FTC has kind of wandered away from what ultimately was legal precedent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I simply would urge an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR.
FITZGERALD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 902. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the February 4, 2021, suspension of early termination to filings made under section 7A of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 18a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds from being made available to the FTC to enforce the suspension of early terminations to merger filings made under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act.

The FTC is authorized to terminate this waiting period early upon the request of the parties or on their own. After determining that the transaction does not pose significant competitive concerns, the ruling will be made.

In February 2021, the early termination process was “temporarily” suspended due to the impact of COVID, and the suspension remains in place nearly 3 years later. Prior to the suspension, early termination was granted in approximately half of all reported transactions.

The world obviously has moved on from COVID, and it is time for the FTC to move on, as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “aye” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Current law requires that a party wishing to complete an acquisition must delay the transaction for at least 30 days following the submission of a pre-merger notification to give the FTC and DOJ an opportunity to review the transaction and determine whether to investigate it further. The statute gives the FTC and DOJ the ability to grant an individual case exemption from this requirement to wait 30 days. Granting this early termination, however, consumes agency resources, and the delay for parties associated with suspending early termination is minimal.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I simply move an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement the

proposed revisions, published on April 6, 2023, to OMB Circular A-4.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to prohibit the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, from implementing its April 6, 2023, revisions to OMB Circular A-4.

These revisions are an attempt to rewrite and water down the regulatory guardrails currently in place so that the Biden administration can promulgate regulations that dramatically overstate the benefits and underrepresent the costs.

The Biden administration has big plans to spend your hard-earned money and reshape your way of life. They are working to concoct all manner of massively expensive regulations, including rules on climate change, social equity, income redistribution, and creating a “social cost of carbon.”

However, even the profligate Biden administration has realized that it faces checks and guardrails on its regulatory authorities as a result of OMB’s Circular A-4, which provides objective and nonpartisan guidance to agencies for considering the impacts of different regulatory actions.

OMB Circular A-4 came from a 1993 Clinton-era executive order providing agencies with a framework and guardrails for considering different regulatory approaches that truly maximize benefits for the American people and minimize costs.

The April 6, 2023, revisions to OMB Circular A-4 are a departure from bipartisan and widely accepted practices and principles and are a thinly veiled attempt to push through the radical leftist agenda by stacking the deck in favor of extremely costly regulations.

Perhaps the most egregious part of these revisions to Circular A-4 is that they will allow agencies to consider not only the benefits of regulations to Americans, who are the ones footing the bill, but benefits that accrue across the entire world. This would surely result in agencies dramatically overstating the purported benefits of regulations that can be seen as having global benefits, such as anything invoking the phrases “climate change” or “social cost of carbon.”

In order to enact its radical agenda, the Biden administration needs to rewrite OMB Circular A-4 so that the cost of its regulatory regime can be minimized and the benefits dramatically overstated.

We must reject the attempt to “stack the deck” so the Biden administration can radically reshape our lives and reach even deeper into our pockets.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The proposed revisions that this amendment seeks to block to OMB Circular A-4 include updates that consider the social cost of carbon and other climate-related factors in regulatory impact analyses. This change recognizes the urgency of addressing climate change and aligns Federal agencies with efforts to mitigate its impacts.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, we do not need this concoction of “social cost of carbon” visited upon us in this country that will cost us lots and lots of money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, again, we need to stop the Biden administration from implementing its revisions to OMB Circular A-4. We don’t need to water down the regulatory guardrails currently in place and dramatically overstate the benefits and underrepresent the costs of their rules. This needs to be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. FRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the salary or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury Climate Hub.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to introduce an amendment that prohibits the funding of the Treasury Department’s wasteful Climate Hub initiative, which was rolled out by the Biden administration in 2021.

My constituents sent me to Washington to restore fiscal sanity to our Federal Government and get back to

the basics. It makes zero sense to have a climate hub under the Treasury Department.

This country is over \$33 trillion in debt. Americans are tired of seeing their tax dollars used to bloat and embolden Federal agencies. They are tired of seeing these agencies usurping power to pursue extreme agendas. They are tired of this Biden administration turning a blind eye to address real problems that Americans face while pursuing an agenda that only liberal elites benefit from.

They have loosely defined their so-called climate strategy while pumping billions and billions of dollars into pursuing and enforcing out-of-touch regulations.

Mr. Chairman, as our country sinks deeper and deeper into debt every day, I see no basis for a climate hub to exist in the Department that should be focused on our country's finances. Instead of prioritizing legitimate functions within the Treasury Department, such as promoting economic growth in America, managing our government's finances effectively, and ensuring the soundness of our financial system, Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department's Climate Hub is just another example of how Democrats and this administration want our Federal Government to grow in scope and power and ignore the core functions of their mission.

Time and time again, we have seen this administration embark upon a rogue spending spree in the name of climate change and apply its own definition of fiscal responsibility to its decisionmaking. Rather than confronting the immediate challenges that face our country, Washington bureaucrats are caught up in their own climate policy echo chamber, and it seems to me that many of them care more about a photo op than enacting sound and well-thought-out policy.

This administration has telegraphed to the American people that climate change is the only threat to our humanity and is more serious than nuclear war. Everyday Americans can see right through the hypocrisy of this administration. I remind everyone that Americans deserve better from their government.

My amendment would put an end to the Treasury Department's wasteful Climate Hub. The United States Treasury has absolutely no reason to use taxpayer funds for this initiative.

I am committed to standing up for fiscal responsibility, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Treasury's Climate Hub was created to leverage the Department's finance and financial mitigation efforts to con-

front the growing threat of climate change.

In just over 2 years, the hub has been instrumental in the implementation of the tremendously successful Inflation Reduction Act. The hub also contributed to successful negotiations that led to a substantial public-private climate finance commitment with South Africa and Indonesia.

This amendment would impede the Treasury's climate policy strategy as our Nation faces growing climate threats.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, again, I think the basis of this is that we must get back to the basics. The Treasury Department has no basis for undertaking this initiative.

Mr. Chair, I continue to urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Chairman, we cannot accept that every agency can focus its time and resources on aspects outside of their design and control. If we ever hope to get our economy back on track and our country back on track, we can't continue to allow this administration or the Treasury Department to ignore its core responsibilities.

I am proud to introduce this amendment, and I once again urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the acquisition of property for a new fully consolidated headquarters of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, the FBI wants a massive new complex for their Washington, D.C., area activities. They want to spend more than \$300 million on that complex.

Though the FBI has an employee base that is about 2.3 percent of the United States military, Mr. Chairman,

they are literally asking for something that is larger than the Pentagon for the FBI.

My amendment would disallow any planning, spending, or distribution of funds for that purpose. I don't believe that the FBI deserves a massive new headquarters or Washington field office.

The activities inside of Washington, the Greater Washington metro area, have really driven a lot of the investigative work we have done. It is not bad folks from the FBI out of some field office in middle America or elsewhere in the country. It is the Washington, D.C.-based activities that have pressured other field offices for no good law enforcement reason. It is the D.C.-based entities that have suppressed credible investigative leads into criminal conduct over the objections of other bureaus and offices, and they have initiated investigations into American citizens merely for engaging in constitutionally protected speech.

They have attempted to entrap Members of the United States Senate by holding false classified briefings. That is the testimony we got from Senator GRASSLEY and Senator JOHNSON.

They have also worked hard to censor factual information harmful to their preferred political candidates, notably the Hunter-Biden laptop story that the FBI based in the D.C. metro area was involved in cajoling censorship of.

Building a new headquarters would condone, reinforce, and enable the Washington field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's nefarious behavior. We shouldn't do it, and we should adopt this amendment to ensure that is the case.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, my thanks to the minority side for giving me an opportunity to speak. I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Florida's amendment.

We are not always going to hate the FBI. I realize there are people on my side of the aisle that don't like some of the activities of the FBI. I am not going to pick an argument on that.

What I will argue is that it is bad policy for the Congress to be taking steps to deny a Federal agency that is in serious need, in my opinion, of an improvement to their headquarters.

Now, notice I said improvement. I didn't say some massive, big expansion, necessarily. What I do know is that when I toured the FBI headquarters, I saw it in a state of disrepair that is going to need the attention of the owners of that property. That is us. To

deny the FBI the opportunity to be able to explore other alternatives, I think, is a bit shortsighted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. The fact is the building is crumbling, and there is going to be a need to do something. What that something is, I am not an expert on. I think it would be wrong for us to be taking this action today pursuant to this amendment without having at least a hearing and an opportunity for the people responsible for the facilities—FBI, GSA, any other stakeholder—to be able to help us understand what the situation is today and what the needs are of tomorrow. That discussion can take place, should take place, but I think it is a bit shortsighted and premature for us to be taking the action that this amendment would call for here today.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, it is not my grave concern that the FBI's building is crumbling. It is my grave concern that the civil liberties of Americans are crumbling. I wish we were more worried about that and less worried about whether or not we have new carpet and wallpaper at the FBI building.

My colleague from Arkansas says that the FBI headquarters is in a state of disrepair. Mr. Chair, it is the FBI itself that is in a state of disrepair.

While my colleague from Arkansas may be right that we may not always hate the FBI, how about while we are most concerned about the things they are doing we not go build them a new \$300 million building.

My colleague says there needs to be a hearing. Let me tell you about the hearing that mattered to me. Frankly, many of my Democrat colleagues are also worried about civil liberties. That was the hearing where we learned that the FBI has conducted over 278,000 illegal queries on the FISA system, or the hearing that said that the Inspector General found that 38 times an hour these people were violating FISA.

The notion that we would stand here and defend them, frankly, is deeply disappointing. I think those folks deserve to sit in the rat-infested J. Edgar Hoover Building until they get their act straight with America's civil liberties.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank the chairman for his comments.

I understand what the gentleman, Mr. GAETZ, is saying. His ire is directed at people. The people will be transitory. People come and go. Members come and go from the Congress of the United States.

What will not be transitory is the ability to have a critically important agency for us in the long-term to carry

out its duty, which is, after all, to defend America, our Constitution, from enemies both foreign and domestic, and their duties have been changed to a significant degree since 9/11.

What this structure that is proposed to be built is supposed to do is to accommodate the fact that the present building is falling down and is dangerous to those who work there, some of whom are clerical people not making any decisions with respect to policy. I would think the gentleman would be concerned about their safety, as am I, and as is the chairman, and the safety of those, frankly, who walk around the building. If the gentleman visited there, he is going to see netting around the building because the concrete is falling off the building.

I would share, obviously, the chairman's view. I am not totally objective. They are going to build it somewhere in this region. I live in this region. I am supportive of this region.

I think we shouldn't transfer ire against the people who are in positions in the FBI at this point in time.

This building, when and if it is built, is going to be built sometime in the future and is absolutely essential. FBI Directors preceding the present FBI Director a number of times have said this is needed. Experts have said it is needed. The GSA says it is needed. I would hope that we would not, because of the temporary displeasure or ire or anger or stronger feeling, if you want to express it, of the present occupants or the actions they are taking, would not adversely reflect on the judgment as to whether or not a new capital facility for a critically important agency is necessary at this time.

I would hope the gentleman would withdraw his amendment. I don't expect that to happen. If he doesn't withdraw it, I hope it is defeated.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, where I think Leader HOYER is correct is that this effort would be incomplete in the absence of major reforms to FISA and the other authorities that are abused, no matter who the people are. The people have changed and the corruption has remained the same at the FBI. Under Republican and Democrat leadership, we have seen consistent abuses of Americans' civil liberties. To take tax money away from our fellow Americans, who are the victims at times of these abuses, and then build a new center for the FBI seems deeply unwise to me.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I don't want any misinterpretation that I adopted the gentleman's premise as to the activities of the FBI. I disagree with that.

Mr. GAETZ. I appreciate that clarification, and I don't think anyone would confuse his views with mine as it relates to the FBI.

Mr. HOYER. Thank God for that.

Let me say that in the concept of what we are doing, this is necessary,

forgetting about any of the other issues.

I understand what he is saying. I disagree with him, but I appreciate his position and why he is saying it. To be so, in my opinion, shortsighted that we delay further—this building has been delayed. The first request for new facilities was 2009, so we are now talking a decade-and-a-half essentially. That was my point, but I don't want to be confused that I adopt his premise on the FBI activities.

Mr. GAETZ. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the distinction, and I am grateful that there are a number of Democrats, like Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. NADLER, who are working very closely with Republicans to try to reform these authorities so that people's Fourth Amendment rights are not violated. Doing that alongside creating some new \$300 million monstrosity for the FBI, that is, quite literally, larger than the Pentagon, sends entirely the wrong message, and that would support adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I stand with the bipartisan statesmen who have argued against this amendment. I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. GOOD OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including titles IV and VIII, may be used to require any individual to receive a vaccine against COVID-19.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment that would ensure that no taxpayer dollars are used to implement a vaccine mandate. This amendment applies across the Federal Government as well as to the District of Columbia since the

District falls under the oversight of the Congress and uses taxpayer dollars for its operation as the seat of the United States Government.

We cannot forget how the COVID lockdowns were exploited by the government to infringe on the personal liberties of Americans. These tyrannical lockdowns and mandates were used to inflict unneeded economic damage on small towns in rural America and on businessowners across the country.

The government crushed the economy during COVID with unjustified lockdowns, lockouts, restrictions, mandates, and more. The government harmed and mistreated our children during COVID by closing schools, requiring masks, and enforcing vaccines on those who were never truly at risk from the virus. The government suppressed information and perpetuated lies. The government prevented doctors and healthcare providers from doing what they believed was best for their patients to combat COVID.

The government trampled on basic liberties such as the freedom of speech and expression, the freedom of worship, the freedom of assembly, the freedom to make a living or to operate your business, the freedom of movement and travel, the freedom to educate your children, and much more.

The government lied about the risk of the virus. The government lied about the effectiveness of the vaccine. The government lied about the need to wear a mask. The government treated everyone like those who were truly at risk, the elderly and those with extra comorbidity factors.

The government forced the termination of frontline medical personnel, first responders, law enforcement, and military personnel for not getting a vaccine, regardless of whether or not they were at serious risk or had already had the virus, and therefore, had natural immunity. The government stripped away the right to privacy, medical freedom, and bodily autonomy. The government didn't follow the science.

History will judge the government harshly for the harm done to the American people, especially to our children, during the pandemic.

President Biden mercifully, finally declared the COVID-19 public health emergency over just on May 11 of this year. This was long past due.

Unfortunately, though, vaccine mandates are still in place in some places across the country. In fact, nearly 100 universities across the country still require a COVID-19 vaccine just to attend school this year, for college students who were never at serious risk for the virus.

It is time we protect taxpayers from unwillingly funding more restrictive mandates. More importantly, it is time we protect Americans' most basic fundamental liberties.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this

commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. This amendment would prohibit the District of Columbia from using its local funds to require an individual to receive a COVID-19 vaccine.

How D.C. spends its local funds, which consists of local taxes and fees, should be a decision for D.C., not Congress. If D.C.'s local elected officials want to spend local funds on requiring individuals to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, they should have the authority to do so. If they do not want to spend local D.C. funds on requiring individuals to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, they should have the authority not to do so.

D.C.'s local elected officials are accountable to D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like the decisions of their local elected officials, they can vote them out of office.

D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves. If House Republicans cared about democratic principles or D.C. residents, they would bring my D.C. statehood bill which would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government to this floor.

Congress has the constitutional authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. It simply lacks the will.

I say to every Member of Congress, keep your hands off D.C. If you want to legislate on local D.C. matters, become a D.C. resident and get elected Mayor or councilmember.

Mr. Chair, I urge colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleague from the other side that, yes, this amendment would prohibit the requirement of the COVID vaccine in Washington, D.C.—not just the COVID-19 vaccine, though. Can you believe they really still want to require the COVID-19 vaccine now, nearly 4 years later?

□ 1600

We are talking about vaccines more generally and more broadly. We need to protect the minority from the tyranny of the majority.

Unfortunately, D.C. has demonstrated they certainly need the congressional oversight that is afforded to this body in the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, COVID-19 restrictions hurt millions of Americans, countless businesses, and many communities in our great Nation. Too many people were forced to make a choice between freedom—basic fundamental freedom—and keeping their job.

The virus was going to do what the virus was going to do. We all got it.

There was nothing we could do to prevent us from getting it. The Federal Government was the worst offender, imposing draconian measures and mandates to stop the spread. We all remember that.

How many employees were fired because they made their own personal medical choices; not to mention our servicemembers who were dishonorably discharged for exercising their freedom not to get the vaccine.

Taxpayer dollars should never flow to any entity that forces people to take an experimental shot. We must safeguard personal freedoms. Isn't that the fundamental responsibility of this government and Congress?

We need to protect the right for all Americans to make the best medical decisions for themselves. We must say, in no uncertain terms, never again. Never again would we allow government to do what they did to the American people during the COVID pandemic.

My amendment simply blocks funding from going toward any authoritarian vaccine mandate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. GOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prohibit the voluntary disclosure policy for White House visitor access records.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Biden administration promised us that they would be the most transparent administration in our Nation's history.

Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, they have not followed through on that promise. In fact, the White House visitor log policy provides the American people the ability to see who is lobbying this administration.

However, the Biden administration has made significant efforts to ensure this policy is nearly impossible to take

effect as intended. Despite Republicans sending correspondence to the administration requesting the disclosure of this information, the White House has not followed through and remains highly secretive. While they released some portions of visitor logs, the American people deserve full transparency.

Here are just a few examples of the Biden administration's secrecy. The White House has deliberately omitted Hunter Biden's visitor logs from the database.

They have made it apparent that no records of visitors to the Delaware residence exists. When asked to disclose the details, they denied any intent to publish visitor access logs at the President's Delaware home.

Mind you, the President has spent well over 200 days of his Presidency at that location, which was also investigated when confidential classified documents were found.

Their failure to disclose all visitor logs between the White House and the President's Delaware property have directly contradicted this administration's claims of being the most transparent administration.

These failures prove the administration's commitment to restore integrity, transparency, and trust in government is merely lip service. We have seen this across all levels of the Biden administration, whether it is the press secretary selectively allowing only cherry-picked questions, or the White House hiding the visitor logs to his retreat in Delaware where he was keeping classified documents.

This amendment will require the White House to be transparent and prohibit them from failing to disclose visitor logs in a timely and accurate manner in any way.

We can no longer allow the Biden administration to use a lack of transparency as a shield to mask their actions from public accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, the amendment doesn't do anything. It simply says funds in the bill can't be used to prevent voluntary disclosures. The administration is already doing this.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I would help my friend across the aisle with the examples that I just gave. They have deliberately omitted Hunter Biden's visitor logs, and they certainly have omitted visitor logs from the President's residence in Delaware where he spent over 200 days.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does nothing, and we oppose it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate new rules that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(1) an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more;

(2) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

(3) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when our constituents go to the ballot box and they vote for their Member of Congress, they expect that it is going to be someone that actually represents them, represents their values, and represents the community.

What we have seen in this administration is bureaucrats—people that are unelected and unaccountable—draft new regulations that impose incredible financial hardship on the American people.

In fact, during the first 2 years of the Biden administration, there are estimates that show that hundreds of billions of dollars in new regulatory costs were heaped upon American businesses and heaped upon American families.

Let me say that again. Hundreds of billions of dollars in additional regulatory compliance costs. Otherwise said, it is a hidden tax.

Mr. Chairman, this is not you and I—these are not Members of Congress—that are approving and drafting these regulations. They are bureaucrats. What our amendment simply does is it says that those bureaucrats can continue to draft the amendments. If their regulation is going to cause over \$100 million in compliance costs, then it must be submitted to the Congress to allow for their elected Representatives to either affirm or deny that regulation.

tion—that cost on the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple amendment. I make note that this amendment has been included in previous appropriations bills. I hope my friends on the other side agree that we need to be representing our constituents, not unelected bureaucrats.

I hope that they share the concern I have that hundreds of billions of dollars in invisible taxes being heaped upon American businesses and families is inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would fully block any rulemaking that the Office of Management and Budget's, Office of Information Regulatory Affairs determines to be significant. Each year that division can review anywhere from 300 to 700 rules.

There is no available data to determine how many of these reviews result in a significant determination. However, roughly, 100 rules each year clear the higher economically significant threshold.

This amendment would block any work on the roughly 100 economically significant rules the government promulgates annually and likely blocks countless others that result in a significant determination.

This amendment would grind government to a halt and interrupt vital work to improve the lives of Americans across a range of policy areas.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns, but let's go ahead and think about what his concerns are based upon. The gentleman raised concerns that if this amendment passes, it is going to prevent the Biden administration from unilaterally implementing regulations 100 times that each cost over \$100 million to comply with.

I am sure my friend shares the concern that these really need to be actions of the Congress. We come in and affirm congressional intent. We come in and affirm the interpretations of law.

If a bureaucrat is going to impose that kind of cost on American businesses and, most importantly, on American families that are already struggling with record-high energy costs, interest rates, and inflationary costs that are all being imposed on these family members, this harms those who can least afford it the most.

It really seems like my friend could reconsider the objection, that we could simply allow for Members of Congress to represent their constituents as opposed to unelected bureaucrats.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say I regret that the gentleman is opposed. Earlier this year, he voted in support of an administrative PAYGO provision that takes a very similar approach here that puts in a threshold that requires that additional scrutiny be applied to any regulation, or it be offset with additional costs. I think this is compatible with that. It takes the next step to ensure that American citizens are represented by their Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed part B of House Report 118-269.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

□ 1615

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report Number 118-269.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I rise to point out something that is pretty obvious to everybody, and that is that this process that we are going through right now can come across very complicated, but it is a broken budget process system.

What I would like to see happen as we matriculate through the remainder of the Financial Services-General Government bill and as we move toward trying to get something done on Commerce-Justice-Science and Labor-Health and Human Services is that maybe we would have this moment of sobriety as a House and recognize that fixing this broken budget process is going to be essential if this Congress is going to be successful.

We are sitting here today with a clock ticking and the sand is in the hourglass running right through to where on November 17 we could be facing a government shutdown. There have been many opportunities for us to complete our work on appropriations, move bills through the House, get them conference with the Senate, and get them signed into law. Of course, we are

working against a deadline at the end of this year that will require a 1 percent sequester if we don't get all 12 bills through.

So it is my fervent belief that Congress can fix this issue if Congress will recognize that it has an issue. I think the American people recognize it. We are looking right down the barrel of a government shutdown. If we can't find the resources to prevent a lapse in government funding by next weekend and then even at the end of this year, we are, as I said, facing that 1 percent sequester.

So we have a lot of work to do that is going to require the cooperation of the left and the right to be able to come to terms, fix our broken budget process system, and get this regular order system back and working for the American people.

I was hoping for some buy-in from my friends on the left because they, too, recognize this process, but I guess they look at us and say: You are the governing majority, and it is up to you to make this thing work.

Nevertheless, it has been broken with both sides being in control, so it is essential, I think, that we do that.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MRS. HARSHBARGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) for the salary or expenses of an officer or employee of the Gender Policy Council of the Executive Office of the President; or

(2) to carry out the duties and responsibilities of such Council.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment which would defund and effectively eliminate the Biden administration's pro-abortion and pro-transgender policy council which is housed in the Executive Office of the President. The Biden administration has declared war on science, basic biology, and the concept of gender.

The American taxpayer should not be funding an office in the White House that is dedicated to spreading this administration's woke DEI agenda. Americans should know what DEI really stands for: division, exclusion, and indoctrination.

Through various directives such as the Department of Education, President Biden has made it abundantly clear that his priorities are not promoting the policies that benefit the majority of Americans but are promoting an extreme agenda.

They are forcing our daughters to compete against biological males in sports, forcing young women to share locker rooms and bathrooms with men, and launching pressure campaigns to encourage minors to take life altering hormones or undergo experimental surgeries.

One must ask: Why are we promoting these radical policies, and why is the taxpayer funding it?

The White House Gender Policy Council's executive director wants to lecture Americans, specifically our children, about her belief that racism and sexism are somehow built into our health system. The White House Gender Policy Council exists in a White House that is incapable of defining what a woman is.

This amendment is as much about curbing wasteful and unnecessary government spending and being good stewards of taxpayer money as it is about putting an end to the Biden administration's far left ideology being forced on Americans and their children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. To my distinguished colleague from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK): I so appreciate your promptness that we run on your subcommittee, I was just giving you the promptness through this process. So that is why I was allowing you to use the time you had. I just want to explain that so you realize why I was sitting back.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The White House Gender Policy Council is vital in advancing gender equity and equality. It helps ensure that all individuals, regardless of their gender, have equal opportunities and rights. The council takes a holistic approach to addressing gender issues and looking at areas such as economic security, healthcare, education, and violence prevention.

This comprehensive strategy allows for a more effective response to gender-related challenges leading to better outcomes for individuals and communities.

By establishing a dedicated council at the highest levels of government, the White House sends a clear message about the importance of gender equity and inclusion. The White House Gender Policy Council is important for advancing gender, equity, and equality.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chairman, I have a question as to why we even

have a gender policy council when that authority should fall under the Department of Health and Human Services under Secretary Becerra. I think it is a redundancy that we do not need.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I thank my distinguished colleague from the great State of Wisconsin for yielding time to me on this amendment and on the underlying bill.

The question was just asked: Why do we have a White House Gender Policy Council?

It is a pretty simple answer to that question. It is because here in America there are two contrasting visions as it relates to reproductive freedom.

Democrats believe in a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions. Extreme MAGA Republicans have a very different view. Extreme MAGA Republicans want to criminalize abortion care.

Extreme MAGA Republicans want to impose a nationwide ban. Extreme MAGA Republicans want us to live in a society where women have government mandated pregnancies. That is the dichotomy that we confront right now.

Reproductive freedom is at issue all across America, and you are either on the right side of that issue, Mr. Chairman, or you are on the wrong side. We believe that my Republican colleagues continue to march us toward a nationwide abortion ban.

Mr. Chairman, just look at the underlying legislation which, by its very definition, restricts hundreds of thousands of people here in the District of Columbia as it relates to reproductive freedom.

Why is it in this bill?

It is because there is a real policy difference. House Democrats support a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions. Period. Full stop.

It is a choice that should be between a woman, her doctor, her faith, and her family, and not a bunch of extreme politicians. Nevertheless, that is the vision that is being offered to us by our friends on the other side. That is the reason why the White House has taken the step forward to make sure that they are protecting women all across America from efforts to try to criminalize abortion care.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, what lesson has been learned from the events of just this week?

What lesson was learned in Ohio?

What lesson was learned in Virginia?

What lesson was learned in Kentucky, the deepest of red States?

Why does this continue to happen?

They jam an extreme rightwing ideology down the throats of the women of America. That is what we are against. That is why we oppose this amendment. That is one of the reasons why we oppose this underlying bill.

Now, from the very beginning of this Congress, House Democrats have made it clear: We want to find common ground with our Republican colleagues on any issue whenever and wherever possible if it relates to making life better for everyday Americans.

House Democrats are all about putting people over politics: fighting for things like lower costs, growing the middle class, and safer communities. These are things that will make a difference and solve problems in the lives of everyday Americans.

Part of the challenge that we face is that the extreme MAGA Republican agenda continues to be focused on the wrong things. The extreme MAGA Republican agenda is focused on defaulting on America's debt, shutting down the government, crashing the economy, criminalizing reproductive freedom, cutting Social Security and Medicare, impeaching President Biden, and doing nothing to deal with affordability issues or improving the quality of life of everyday Americans.

That is a shame.

So, yes, we are going to continue to oppose Republican efforts to criminalize abortion care now, tomorrow, next month, next year, and forever until this effort to take away reproductive freedom is buried in the ground never to rise again.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chair, nowhere in my remarks did I mention the Hyde amendment. I am talking about a gender policy council that should not exist.

For over 40 years we have had the Hyde amendment in place to where American taxpayer dollars didn't go to fund abortion.

Nowhere did I say that a woman shouldn't have a right to do what she wanted to do, but with the Roe v. Wade reversal, that decision went back to the States where it rightly belonged. In my opinion, over the last 40 to 50 years women have been indoctrinated to think it was a constitutional right to abortion, and it never was.

□ 1630

I am here to set the record straight. It went back to the States where it belongs. All I am trying to say is that we need to get rid of the Gender Policy Council. If they want to put that anywhere, HHS is the Department that it should fall under.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, you heard from our Democratic leader. Democrats strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. HILL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act, including titles IV and VIII, may be used to support the allocation of Special Drawing Rights to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that I hope will garner bipartisan support. I do this with my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee. Chairman BLAINE LUETKEMEYER of Missouri is here with me today.

In 2021, Mr. Chair, the Treasury Department approved \$650 billion in an allocation of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund. That is a bunch of technical words, but in plain English, this means that they were lavishing \$650 billion on all the countries of the world with no strings attached.

The Biden administration claims that this allocation is necessary to have the global adequacy of funding in reserves in each of the sovereign countries of the world. In other words, these reserves from the IMF went to healthy countries, countries that don't need the money, like countries in Europe or the United States. Many countries ended up using this IMF money just to pay short-term bills.

Worst of all, this Special Drawing Rights allocation provided billions of dollars of unconditional liquidity to some of the worst regimes in the world: \$40 billion went to China; \$17 billion went to the Putin regime in Moscow; and Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, the funder of Hamas, the killer of Israelis on October 7, received \$5 billion to boost its reserves.

That is completely at odds with American policy, completely at odds with our sanctions policy against some of the worst regimes in the world.

The amendment we propose today would prohibit the Treasury Department from allocating any more Special Drawing Rights from the IMF to the ayatollahs in Tehran.

Following the October 7 attack by Hamas against our friends in Israel, it would be unacceptable for the IMF to, once again, bolster the reserves of Iran. Money is fungible, and that money goes to Hezbollah and Hamas.

Some of our colleagues might counter that prohibiting more SDRs for Iran means prohibiting them for everybody. That is simply not true.

Mr. Chairman, the IMF has the authority to do special allocations and allocate these Special Drawing Rights reserves to countries of a particular need or concern. We don't have to give this kind of largesse to wealthy countries like the Netherlands or the United States or to rogues like China and Iran.

Some may argue that excluding this is too dramatic and that Treasury itself can designate the whole country as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern, and therefore, Iran can't get it.

This administration has already freed up money for Iran in their recent hostage deal. If Treasury really wants to argue that Iran, the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism, should receive more no-strings-attached money, then come to Congress to make the case, but this is significant and should be decided by the elected officials in this body, not agency officials at the Treasury.

Last month's assault on Israel was a clarifying moment for so many people around the world. This amendment sends a unified message: No more money for bad regimes around the world.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment doesn't belong in this bill. We don't deal with the IMF and Special Drawing Rights. That would be in the State-Foreign Operations bill, which we have already taken up on the floor.

Mr. Chair, I urge the sponsor to take up that bill in the fiscal year 2025 bill, assuming we ever get to that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, I don't consider that a very convincing argument on this amendment. This amendment is a good idea to counter a bad policy.

Blanket money for rogue regimes through the IMF, approved by our Treasury Department and encouraged by the Biden administration, is bad.

Voting for this amendment is good. It sends a message to rogue regimes: You don't get a free lunch from the United States of America.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, as I said, we are not debating the merits of the

amendment. It is just not appropriate in this bill, period.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, let me say, in conclusion, that this is the Treasury bill. This is the bill that appropriates money for the Treasury.

The Rules Committee made this amendment in order because it concerns spending money at the Treasury for bad ideas. Those on this side of the aisle want to counter terrorism, counter bad ideas, counter profligate spending by the IMF to back up rogue regimes.

Mr. Chair, I encourage all Members who want to counter terrorism, counter rogue regimes, speak up for freedom in Israel, speak up for freedom in Ukraine, speak up for freedom on the island of Taiwan to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to authorize a transaction by a United States financial institution (as defined under section 561.309 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) for a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to Executive Order 13902, other than a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, this is sort of a continuation of my friend Mr. HILL's amendment and Mr. BARR's, and other amendments that we have talked about today, which is really about whether we are going to allow the largest state funder of terrorism to continue to have access to hard dollars and continue to have access to the capital that is funding groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestine Islamic Jihad.

Mr. Chair, the deadly terror attacks of October 7 made one thing abundantly clear: The United States cannot continue to allow the Iranian regime

access to funding that, in turn, could be used against our allies and even American citizens.

I am pleased to offer this amendment today, and I hope it will receive bipartisan support because a very similar amendment, Mr. Chair, received a voice vote in 2016 right along these lines.

Last month's barbaric attack against our friends and allies in Israel was a powerful reminder of the dangers posed by Hamas and others.

By the way, Hamas, receives 93 percent of their total funding from Tehran. As we mentioned, Tehran and Iran, being the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, must be cut off from their ability to wage hostilities abroad.

As far-reaching as our Iranian sanctions are, it may surprise some of my colleagues that we have not actually closed all the financing loopholes. The administration still enjoys significant discretion to permit trade and financial services with these bad actors even if it has nothing to do with humanitarian purposes. My amendment would change this.

Under Executive Order No. 13902, the Trump administration made the construction, mining, manufacturing, and textile sectors of the Iranian economy subject to U.S. sanctions, in addition to sanctions in place, many going back to the 2012 NDAA. The Treasury Department later added the financial sector to this group, blacklisting 18 Iranian banks in October 2020. At the same time, the Treasury's Office of Foreign Asset Control, also known as OFAC, retains broad discretion to license transactions with sanctioned Iranians.

Under the Obama administration's nuclear deal, for example, Treasury licensed aircraft sales to Iran Air, which had previously been sanctioned for providing support to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, also known as the IRGC, and to the Defense Ministry.

An amendment to the FSGG appropriations bill to prohibit these licenses was adopted by the House in 2016 by voice vote.

We must not let licenses undermine sanctions under these executive orders, which is why my amendment would prohibit them if they allow Iran to use the U.S. financial system. It is that simple.

The attack on Israel has underscored how we cannot become complacent when it comes to blocking Iran from the goods, technology, and hard currency it needs to fund terrorist groups, such as Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestine Islamic Jihad, and many others.

In addition to being the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, Iran has been designated by Treasury as a jurisdiction of primary laundering concern.

Mr. HILL just referenced in his amendment that Treasury does have the ability to put these jurisdictions on money laundering, but they have rescinded that, Mr. Chair. They allow these exemptions.

That is why Mr. HILL's amendment, my amendment, and other amendments are trying to narrow that down and tighten that down. Clearly, we should shield our financial institutions from contact with the country to the fullest extent possible.

Now, let me address potential objections. Some might ask about humanitarian aid under this measure.

My amendment does nothing—let me repeat, nothing—to affect existing exemptions for agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices. These exemptions have long been codified into our laws, and this amendment does not change that. This is explicit in the text of the amendment.

Mr. Chair, you may have heard and seen those media reports about phantom false billing that might be happening or black market deals where those goods and services are delivered and being misused and even sold on the black market for that cash. That is another issue, and we need to address that, but that is not what we are getting at here in this one.

Others might ask whether this amendment could limit Treasury's ability to license transactions as future ransom for hostages, for example, or even as part of a new nuclear deal.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Treasury Department has identified significant technical concerns with this amendment. Specifically, the agency has concerns about how the amendment's construction would impact general licenses authorized by the Office of Foreign Assets Control.

I strongly agree with the need to enforce the sanctions included in Executive Order No. 13902 with respect to any person determined to operate in the construction, mining, manufacturing, or textile sectors of the Iranian economy. However, some terms like "Islamic Republic of Iran" and "for, or on behalf of" are vague and would create confusion as to how they would relate to existing authorizations.

Treasury believes this phrasing could cause unintended consequences outside of the intended scope.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I oppose the amendment and recommend a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR.
LUETKEMEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act, including titles IV and VIII, may be used to support a quota increase for the People's Republic of China at the International Monetary Fund.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to offer this amendment today with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) as a cosponsor, who was here a minute ago. I am confident it will garner bipartisan support.

My amendment would prohibit funds from this bill from being used to support a shareholding increase for China at the International Monetary Fund, the IMF.

The IMF is the world's lender of last resort and plays a critical role in ensuring multilateral cooperation on a wide array of financial matters.

As the IMF's largest shareholder, the U.S. is the only member to wield a veto over important decisions at the Fund. This includes decisions that change countries' shareholding weight at the institution.

Across administrations, the U.S. has advocated for the IMF to support fiscal responsibility among borrowers, responsible governance of exchange rates, and transparency in sovereign lending. These principles support global financial stability, but they have now been put at risk by China's dictatorship.

Put simply, the emergence of China as the world's largest official creditor has saddled countries around the world with opaque and onerous debt that the IMF has been called upon to resolve. None of this lending complies with international rules and norms like those established by the Paris Club and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Although Chinese lending to developing countries has declined since its heyday in 2016, it still racked up \$79 billion in commitments across the board in 2021. Much of this lending is shifting from infrastructure to emergency lending. In other words, China itself is adopting a role that the IMF has been traditionally playing.

Moreover, China's flouting of international lending standards mirrors its nontransparent management of its domestic currency, the renminbi. It is

shocking, but undeniably true, that the IMF has limited insight into the exchange rate regime of the world's second largest economy. This is why my amendment is so important.

The IMF is finishing a review of its shareholding by the end of this year. China continues to argue that its shares, referred to as a quota at the Fund, don't accurately reflect its weight in the world economy. It has pushed and will continue to push for a greater say on the board of IMF.

My argument boils down to this: Shareholding at these institutions is not about the size of a country's economy, but, rather, its commitment to international rules and good-faith cooperation. As long as China dismisses every principle of the IMF's foundation, we cannot reward it with a stronger voice at the Fund. It would be absurd to increase its shareholding weight at the IMF when it is refusing to restructure much of its predatory lending to the Fund's borrowers.

The Treasury Department represents us at the Fund, and I am pleased that it has conveyed Congress' skepticism toward a quota increase for China. However, there is no formal agreement at the IMF yet. This amendment will help ensure that boosting China's influence is off the table. The amendment also sets a marker for future shareholding reviews, where my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee and I will insist on real accountability from Beijing.

China would have us believe that the U.S. threatens global cooperation by denying it a more prominent seat at the table, but the opposite is true. It is China's disregard for transparency making our opposition to its influence at the IMF and other multilateral organizations absolutely vital.

I would add that China's abuse of human rights at home, including its genocide of the Uyghurs is yet another reason why legitimizing Beijing at an international institution is unacceptable.

We must draw a line in the sand, which is what my amendment does. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment doesn't belong in this bill. We don't deal with the IMF and shareholding. That would be part of the State and Foreign Operations bill, which has already gone through this body.

I urge the sponsor to take up the issue in that bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, I would just argue that the Treasury Department is in charge of various activities with regard to the governance of

these boards, whether the World Bank, IMF, et cetera. These are entities that we fund. We are on these boards, and these boards direct funds that we have put in these entities. It is our job to make sure that the Treasury Department does its job, which is to monitor this, be on the boards, behave in a responsible fashion, and also to stop the nonsense going on around the world with bad actors such as Iran and this situation where I am talking about here with China.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, as well.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 69 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. MEUSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule of the Small Business Administration entitled “Affiliation and Lending Criteria for the SBA Business Loan Programs”, issued on April 10, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 21890).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today in support of my amendment No. 70 to H.R. 4664.

In May of this year, the Small Business Administration implemented a final rule on affiliation and lending criteria that eliminated longstanding guardrails and prudent lending standards for its flagship 7(a) loan program.

Chief among these changes is the SBA’s decision to eliminate the prescriptive lending criteria that has allowed the program to function with integrity for decades.

The 7(a) lending program offers government-backed loans to businesses that are guaranteed by the taxpayer up to 85 percent. By removing the prudent underwriting standards for all lenders in the program, the SBA has opened up the program to increased fraud and losses. These changes will add risk to

the SBA’s loan portfolio. If enough of these loans go bad, Congress will have to step in and bail out the program to keep it operational, meaning the weak underwriting standards implemented by this rule could lead to a significant loss of taxpayer dollars. Mr. Chairman, such added risk is unacceptable when taxpayers are on the hook.

This year our country experienced the largest bank failures we have seen since the 2008 financial crisis. The SBA should not be moving forward with their plan to reduce underwriting standards in the 7(a) lending program during these uncertain economic times.

This important amendment would undo the troubling underwriting changes made by the Biden administration. This commonsense measure will restore guardrails on these loans and ensure the longevity of the 7(a) loan program.

Mr. Chair, I thank Small Business Committee Chairman ROGER WILLIAMS along with Representatives Luetkemeyer, Stauber, Ellzey, and Alford for their cosponsorship of this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOLINARO). The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

For years, the Small Business Administration has rightly been concerned about small businesses from underserved communities accessing SBA loans. Through the agency’s affiliation rule, the agency aims to combat persistent gaps in accessing capital that affects these small businesses.

By modernizing the lending criteria and conditions for SBA’s small business loan programs and reducing red tape for SBA lenders, we will see improved access to capital for underserved businessowners, including women, minorities, veterans, and rural entrepreneurs.

Unfortunately, this amendment pulls the rug out from underneath the SBA’s important effort to better support these businesses.

I strongly oppose this amendment. I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will strengthen the already meaningful piece of legislation we are considering today, which cuts wasteful spending and reduces burdensome, costly regulations on small businesses.

Of particular importance, the underlying legislation prohibits the Biden administration from implementing the SEC’s climate disclosure rule, which prioritizes ideology over capital formation for investors.

The legislation also rightfully brings the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under the purview of the congressional appropriations process. The CFPB has lacked transparency and ac-

countability for years while being funded directly by the Federal Reserve, and this bill will give Congress the authority to provide appropriate oversight.

Additionally, the bill will halt the CFPB’s implementation of its onerous 1071 small business data collection rule, which places undue costs and compliance burdens on America’s small businesses and lenders.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4664 is a win for taxpayers, consumers, and for the American financial system. My amendment will help make it an even greater win for small businesses by protecting the soundness and integrity of a program that offers access to affordable and reliable capital for entrepreneurs.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. MOONEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the CBDC Working Group led by the Department of the Treasury.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to push back against what could become one of the greatest government surveillance threats of our time, a central bank digital currency, or CBDC.

My amendment would simply prohibit funding for the CBDC Working Group led by the Treasury Department. A CBDC, commonly referred to as a digital dollar, would be issued and easily tracked by the Federal Government.

Make no mistake, a Federal digital dollar can very easily be used to spy on American citizens and become a social credit system. In Communist China, the digital yuan is being used to spy on its citizens and crack down on dissent. Do not think for a second that the Biden administration would not use a digital dollar to track your gun purchases.

House Republicans have been clear that the Federal Reserve does not have the authority to issue a digital dollar without an act of Congress, and we reaffirmed that in the Financial Services

Committee, on which I serve. However, right now the Federal Reserve is contracting with the private sector to build potential digital dollars for the United States far beyond what could be considered traditional research.

Early last year, President Biden issued an executive order directing government agencies to study creating a Federal digital currency, which led to the creation of this CBDC Working Group. This working group is vaguely tasked with supporting the Federal Reserve's central bank digital currency efforts.

To be clear, Congress has not given the executive branch or the Federal Reserve any direction when it comes to Federal digital currencies. I am grateful that the underlying bill prohibits Federal funding for the establishment of a Federal digital currency, but Congress cannot give an inch. Regardless of your thoughts on a potential digital dollar in the United States, I have severe concerns that Congress should not surrender any authority on such a significant issue.

If this White House wants to research a government surveillance tool that the overwhelming majority of Americans oppose, that direction should come from Congress. That is why my amendment prohibits funding for the CBDC Working Group, to prevent the executive branch from bypassing the will of Congress.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It seems shortsighted to defund an effort to even look at an issue. The Central Bank Digital Currency Working Group is intended to complement the Fed's efforts by considering the implications of a U.S. CBDC.

□ 1700

It would be a good idea to examine whether there are economic benefits, including lower transaction and borrowing costs for U.S. households, businesses, and government.

In addition, the U.S. uses sanctions and other financial measures to address national security threats and deny criminals and other illicit actors access to the U.S. and international financial system.

Development of foreign CBDCs, including multi-CBDC platforms, could diminish the use of our dollar and the effectiveness of our tools in this space. I think it is at least worth letting Treasury look at the issue.

I oppose this amendment, urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do want to point out that 130 countries right now, 90 percent of the world's central banks, are studying and doing research on digital currencies, and, in particular, government-backed digital currencies.

This amendment would prevent the United States from researching an area that 130 countries are right now researching. It would put us very far back at the end of the pack.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4664, the Financial Services appropriations bill and the misguided amendment that would essentially prevent our government from exploring and researching a government-issued central bank digital currency.

This year witnessed the collapse of Silicon Valley Bank, Signature Bank, and other U.S. midsize banks holding a combined \$500 billion in assets, an institutional banking crisis requiring decisive action by the FDIC, Treasury, and the Federal Reserve to protect American investors and the U.S. economy.

We are also in the immediate aftermath of a catastrophic demise of the crypto market following the abrupt implosion of FTX, Celsius, BlockFi, and other crypto companies.

Just this week, FTX founder Sam Bankman-Fried was convicted of seven counts of financial fraud and conspiracy after he stole up to \$14 billion from FTX customers and investors.

Yet, in this climate that demands regulatory oversight and thorough understanding of this market, this appropriations bill actually guts funding for critical agencies that serve to protect American investors, including the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Moreover, to the great detriment of U.S. global economic leadership, the amendment under consideration would prevent the Treasury from even examining a government-backed central bank digital currency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. As I said, Mr. Chairman, more than 130 countries and 90 percent of the world's central banks are exploring their own government-backed digital currencies.

We should not be suppressing innovative approaches without fully evaluating its benefits and the risks to the American public.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill and the amendment that would impede commonsense regulation and research and innovation.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. MOONEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the rule entitled "Private Fund Advisers; Documentation of Registered Investment Adviser Compliance Reviews" (88 Fed. Reg. 63206 (September 14, 2023)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to push back against one of the Securities and Exchange Commission's or SEC's many reckless and irresponsible rules. My amendment simply prohibits funding for the costly and unnecessary private fund adviser rule. I oppose this rule because the overwhelming majority of private equity investments, which this rule would affect, go to small businesses. This rule will have a detrimental impact on the many small businesses across America and in my home State of West Virginia.

Private funds are essentially pools of money collected from multiple investors that the adviser then invests primarily in small- and medium-sized businesses. This SEC rule will reduce the ability of private fund advisers to continue supporting small businesses in West Virginia and America by placing burdensome compliance costs on these funds such as new quarterly statements and annual audits.

Furthermore, the SEC has been unable to articulate how this rule will increase funding for small businesses. Private fund advisers who manage these funds are already well regulated and legally required to act in the best interest of the investors. Unlike the public stock market, it is wealthy individuals and sophisticated institutions like pension funds and university endowments that invest in these private funds. This is nothing more than regulating for the sake of regulating.

When the SEC proposed this rule, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle expressed concerns about the negative impacts this rule would have on small businesses. Just last year, Congress asked the SEC to conduct a full economic analysis of this rule, which the commission failed to do. Many of my colleagues also wrote to the SEC expressing concerns about the negative effects and impact of this rule on the

access to funds for small companies. However, the SEC has not addressed these concerns and has not adequately responded to letters sent by many Members, including Chairman WOMACK.

Given high interest rates and the new capital rules that will further restrict bank lending to companies, now is not the time to restrict the ability of private funds to invest in West Virginia's thousands of small businesses. According to the American Investment Council, 85 percent of equity-backed companies are small businesses, and 89 percent of public pensions invest in private equity funds.

This rule would only unnecessarily restrict the efficient operation of private funds, and it will crowd out smaller and emerging funds and increase the costs to investors. SEC Commissioner Hester Peirce put it best when she said that this rulemaking is "ahistorical, unjustified, unlawful, impractical, confusing, and harmful."

Under Gary Gensler, instead of making the public markets more attractive, the SEC has focused on making the private markets less attractive. My amendment will refocus the SEC on its core mission of protecting retail investors while promoting capital formation and efficient markets. The private fund adviser rule needlessly imposes a one-size-fits-all approach and restrictions on sophisticated institutional investors.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support funding for the small businesses in their district. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is an admirable thing, what the gentleman from West Virginia is proposing, protecting investors, making sure investment money is secure and well protected, but this is attacking the SEC's private fund adviser rule, and that is something that protects investors.

It has been designed with the intent to enhance regulatory oversight and transparency within the private fund industry.

The private fund adviser rule increases investor protection by subjecting private fund advisers to registration and regulatory scrutiny by the SEC.

When you hear the word "regulation," think protection. The rule promotes market integrity and stability by minimizing the risk associated with private fund operations.

Private funds can significantly impact financial markets due to their size and the extent of their investments.

The SEC's private fund adviser rule aims to enhance investor protection. It improves market integrity, and it establishes a consistent regulatory framework for private fund advisers.

This is exactly the kind of protection we need to instill confidence by investors in the market and keep capital flowing in this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Despite what my colleague on the other side says, when I hear regulation, I don't necessarily hear protection. Sometimes I hear just more red tape and more bars to success.

The private fund adviser rulemaking is a perfect example of the aggressive regulatory posture Chairman Gensler has taken that has threatened our markets and financial systems.

Bureaucratic overreach has been a hallmark of this administration's SEC. It is past time, Mr. Chairman, that these rules be stopped.

The sweeping proposal for private fund advisers is a prime instance of the agency's failure to conduct thorough economic analysis, missing the serious potential impact of underserved business and emerging asset managers.

This proposal could create additional hyper-regulatory hurdles for those who have overcome obstacles of their own to break into the market.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. MOORE OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, finalize, or implement the proposed regulation titled "Revising Scope of the Mining Sector of Projects that are Eligible for Coverage Under Title 41 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act" (88 Federal Register 65350).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in 2015, the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council was created specifically to improve "the transparency, predictability, and outcomes of the Federal environmental re-

view and authorization process for certain large-scale critical infrastructure projects."

One of its core missions is to enhance coordination between Federal and State environmental reviews and provide more transparency.

As my constituents in Utah and my colleagues here know, our permitting system has long been too complex. Earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 1, the landmark bill aimed at lowering energy costs and improving our permitting process.

We also passed the Fiscal Responsibility Act this year, which includes important wins to expedite permitting. It was broadly accepted, broadly supported.

Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle understand the importance of permitting reform because we cannot reduce emissions, lower energy prices, or address vulnerabilities in our supply chain without it.

Unfortunately, in September, the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council proposed a rule to limit the scope of mining projects eligible for this expedited process.

This proposed change is shortsighted and exacerbates the permitting delays that stifle the domestic mining industry and our efforts to produce cheaper, cleaner energy. This will hurt critically important mining projects in my home State of Utah and across our entire Nation.

Congress established the steering council to address the delays that continue to be one of the most substantial risks to meeting mineral production goals. This proposed change will threaten U.S. national security and mineral production objectives.

I urge the administration to reverse course, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will just close with this: We have a shortage. We have to rely on foreign sources for some of our critical minerals.

If this rule goes through, it will limit the scope of what we need. It will limit the scope of what we need for our Department of Defense, for national security, and for the environmental agencies.

We have to be able to look at what we can do better here in America so we can provide cleaner technology.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “Conflicts of Interest Associated with the Use of Predictive Data Analytics by Broker-Dealers and Investment Advisers” (88 Fed. Reg. 53960 (August 9, 2023)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, what my amendment does is prohibits the use of funds to finalize, implement, or enforce a proposed rule titled: “Conflicts of Interest Associated With the Use of Predictive Data Analytics by Broker-Dealers and Investment Advisers.”

On July 26, 2023, the SEC proposed a new rule that requires broker-dealers and investment advisers to confront challenges posed by predictive data analytics and related technologies like artificial intelligence. They did this despite no evidence that this technology harms investors.

While technological innovation has significantly enhanced the financial industry's capabilities in auditing, reporting, recordkeeping, trading, and surveillance, the SEC's proposed rule, despite claiming to be technology-neutral, appears to be fundamentally hostile to these advancements.

This rule creates a comprehensive regulatory regime governing any analytical or computational tool whereby information potentially relevant to investments is presented to the public.

This misguided, paternalistic rule declares it is a “conflict of interest” for a firm to communicate to customers any information generated using technology that so much as “takes into consideration” any interest of the firm.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this particular amendment.

Again, it is about protecting investors. The SEC's rule addressing conflicts of interest in the use of this so-called predictive data analytics by broker-dealers and investment advisers places a strong emphasis on protecting investor interests. This rule promotes unbiased decisionmaking by requiring firms to proactively manage and disclose conflicts associated with predictive data analytics.

By addressing conflicts of interest, the SEC's rule contributes to market integrity and fairness, and that is what we need for the constant flow of capital to where it needs to go in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, just like my good friend from Arkansas said, any time I hear an arm of the Federal Government say it is going to protect the public, that means another fine, that means another tax, that means another regulatory commission controlled by bureaucrats.

This proposal is misguided and rests on the false premise that delivering information to customers should be presumed harmful simply because it is consistent with the firm's interests.

The new rules would also impose significant operational challenges and expensive burdens on broker-dealers and investment advisers that use virtually any technology to any degree, without citing any compelling authority or evidence of abuse or wrongdoing.

It is abuse at its highest. It is vague at its highest.

The scope of the new rule also presents challenges. As SEC Commissioner Hester Peirce observed, the proposed definition of covered technology could include technologies long used by broker-dealers and investment advisers, such as spreadsheets, commonly used software, math formulas, and statistical tools.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding.

Look, I am just going to be really brief. What we don't need is a disruption of innovation. That is what we don't need. What we do need in the financial industry are clear rules of the road, not confusing compliance standards within the analytics space.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to support the gentleman from South Carolina's amendment.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 77 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Office of Management and Budget to consider the social cost of greenhouse gases in the development and implementation of a budget for a Federal agency, in any Federal procurement

processes, or when preparing an environmental review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does is prohibit the use of funds by the OMB to consider the “social cost of greenhouse gases.” Try to define “social costs.” It will just result in another fine by government bureaucrats. It is used in the development and implementation of budgets, Federal procurement processes, or environmental reviews.

President Biden is directing agencies to consider the flawed social cost of greenhouse gases in the development and implementation of budgets, the Federal procurement process, and environmental reviews.

Democrats use the social cost of greenhouse gas metrics to justify sweeping climate policies, strict regulations, and, I might add, strict fines.

This impacts everything, from purchasing goods or services to conducting environmental reviews for all kinds of projects and levying climate penalties against private businesses. This is against every private business that is under a lot of stress right now in this country. This is all this bureaucratic process does.

The social cost of greenhouse gases is an extremely inefficient policymaking tool that can easily be manipulated. By boosting the climate cost of projects, regulators could use the social cost of carbon to derail everything from energy to infrastructure projects, not to mention the cost of complying.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The inclusion of the social cost of greenhouse gases in regulatory analyses ensures that the full spectrum of costs associated with greenhouse gas emissions is considered.

This is about full, open, and honest accounting. It includes not only economic costs but also health, environmental, and societal costs, providing a more accurate and comprehensive assessment.

The social costs of greenhouse gases account for the health-related impacts of climate change, such as heat-related illnesses, air pollution, and the spread of diseases from mosquitos, ticks, and fleas.

Inclusion in regulatory analysis leads to decisions that prioritize the protection of public health, reducing the burden on healthcare systems. This leads

to a more comprehensive cost evaluation, encourages emissions reduction, preserves the environment, and promotes sustainable economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, again, this is just another attempt by this radical administration to put up another commission to fleece the American taxpayers who are struggling as it is.

On January 21, 2021, President Biden signed the radical climate Executive Order No. 13990, which established an Interagency Working Group on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases and directed the working group to publish interim estimates of the social cost of carbon, nitrous oxide, and methane.

President Biden is now directing agencies to consider the SC-GHG in the development and implementation of their budgets, Federal procurement processes, and environmental reviews.

Social cost of greenhouse gases metrics are inefficient policymaking tools used to justify sweeping, radical climate policies and strict regulations that are interpreted by lifelong bureaucrats.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, 12 States, including South Carolina, filed a lawsuit against the Biden administration, claiming his calculations and use of the social cost of greenhouse gases are arbitrary and capricious and would harm their local economies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, finalize, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “Substantial Implementation, Duplication, and Resubmission of Shareholder Proposals Under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8” (87 Fed. Reg. 45052 (July 27, 2022)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does is prohibits funding for the SEC’s proposed rule titled: “Substantial Implementation, Duplication, and Resubmission of Shareholder Proposals Under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8.”

Since its origins in the 1940s, the shareholder proposal process has evolved from a modest effort to give shareholders an additional tool for influencing corporate governance to a complex and overpoliticized process.

Under the current SEC rules, even small shareholders who meet the \$2,000 ownership requirement for at least 3 years can submit proposals on public company ballots. This process is overwhelmingly exploited by activists driven by social or political agendas and leads to hundreds of resolutions being filed related to environmental, social, and political issues rather than focusing on a company’s growth and competitiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this particular amendment, which would block a rule that promotes meaningful shareholder engagement by requiring a higher level of shareholder support for resubmitted proposals.

This rule helps streamline the shareholder proposal process by discouraging the repetitive submission of proposals that have failed to gain substantial support in the past. By requiring shareholders to demonstrate substantial support for their proposals, the rule encourages responsible activism and discourages the use of the shareholder proposal process for purely symbolic or nuisance proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, any time I hear the Federal government say they are going to streamline anything, it kind of raises my eyebrows.

In fact, based on the SEC’s own data, a single shareholder proposal can impose costs of more than \$100,000, with many firms reporting significantly higher costs, which are ultimately borne by that company’s shareholders.

Congress never granted the SEC authority to make it mandatory for companies to include shareholder proposals in corporate proxy statements, especially after companies already rejected substantially similar politically charged proposals.

Not only does this rule overstep the authority given to the SEC, but it also raises numerous constitutional concerns and is a clear violation of the First Amendment’s prohibition on government-compelled speech.

Political performance does not belong in the boardroom. Instead, compa-

nies should focus on maximizing shareholder value.

Again, all this does is add another bureaucratic nightmare to the taxpayers that are already struggling.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, finalize, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “Enhanced Disclosures by Certain Investment Advisers and Investment Companies About Environmental, Social, and Governance Investment Practices” (87 Fed. Reg. 36654 (June 17, 2022)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

□ 1730

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, this is just another long list that you have witnessed today and really all through this administration of bureaucratic overreach and fines to administer on the taxpayer.

What my amendment does is prohibit use of funds to implement, finalize, or enforce a proposed rule titled: “Enhanced Disclosures by Certain Investment Advisers and Investment Companies About Environmental, Social, and Governance Investment Practices.”

On May 25, 2022, the SEC proposed rules that mandate additional disclosures for funds incorporating or contemplating ESG factors in their investment strategies.

If adopted, the rule would reflect a significant shift in the SEC’s current disclosures regime for private fund sponsors by focusing disclosure on a particular targeted aspect of the investment process.

The primary purpose of this rule is to address the risk of greenwashing and furnish investors with more comprehensive information regarding ESG strategies.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, as well.

Contrary to the misrepresentations made by environmental, social, and governance opponents, the SEC's disclosure rule on ESG investments takes no position on the merits of these approaches.

The rule does not define ESG or stipulate any particular approach to it. Instead, this is a rule that requires, for those who make such investments, the disclosure of information about how ESG is defined and implemented in applicable investment portfolios.

The rule will offer increased transparency for investors and protect them from exaggerated or unfounded claims related to ESG investments being made.

Now, if it passes, my friend from South Carolina's amendment would leave investors in the dark and leave them vulnerable to getting misled or bamboozled about ESG claims.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I take issue with my good friend on the opposite aisle. In fact, I would note the Supreme Court's recent decision in *West Virginia v. EPA* raises concerns about the Commission's ability to implement both this proposal and the broader Climate Disclosure Rule under the major questions doctrine.

This is overexcessive. It is excessively broad, intricate, overly prescriptive, and vague. Again, this is just another bureaucratic commission set up to fleece the taxpayers and fleece the people that made this country.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, for the reasons previously stated, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. NUNN OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I have amendment No. 80 at the desk, the cybersecurity incident disclosure rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule of the Securities and Exchange Commission titled "Cybersecurity

Risk Management, Strategy, Governance, and Incident Disclosure" (88 Fed. Reg. 51896; published August 4, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment, which I am proud to co-lead with my colleague from New York, Mr. GARBARINO.

This amendment prohibits funding to implement the Cybersecurity Risk Management, Strategy, Governance, and Incident Disclosure rule.

Now, as someone who has served for more than two decades in cybersecurity both in the U.S. military, as well as the chief of counterintelligence at ODNI for cyber, the National Cyber Counterintelligence Officer, as well as service in the Obama administration's White House as part of the National Security Council, combating cyberattacks from foreign adversaries are important to both my colleagues on the left and to us here on the right.

Irrespective of the SEC's intent to standardize these requirements, these new and expansive disclosure requirements have the opposite effect on our cybersecurity and safeguards here at home. Instead of working to achieve a regulatory harmonization across the Federal Government, this rulemaking creates duplicative, burdensome regulations and causes even more confusion in our public and private sectors.

Worse yet, the SEC's cybersecurity disclosure rule compromises the confidentiality of each company's cybersecurity program, opening them up to potentially further attacks that can harm instead of protect both the companies and the investors that they are charged with protecting.

This rule mandates disclosure of any material cybersecurity incident within 4 business days. The disclosure requires companies to disclose when it is the victim of a cyberattack, as well as the nature, the timing, the scope of an incident, and its material impact, often times before law enforcement has even had the opportunity to fully evaluate this.

Disclosure of this type of information to the public before it is remediated would achieve the same effect as disclosing these vulnerabilities before there is even a patch, leading other bad actors to exploit the same vulnerabilities potentially for themselves, in effect providing a best practices to the worst actors.

It is clear that we must work together to be able to increase resiliency in cybersecurity across the board, but the SEC's rule falls short and fails to strike the right balance between the regulatory burden and improving security outcomes.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, I am offering this amendment to ensure that we do not inadvertently jeopardize companies' confidentiality reporting strate-

gies and publicly divulge bad information to bad actors to further threaten the United States.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is an amendment that would block the SEC's rule to require companies to disclose material cybersecurity incidents to their investors.

As SEC Chair Gary Gensler puts it: Whether a company loses a factory in a fire—or millions of files in a cybersecurity incident—it may be material to investors.

Mr. Chair, many public companies already provide their investors with cybersecurity incident disclosures. These rules merely make such disclosures more consistent and comparable in a way that can be useful for those making investment decisions.

Why in the world would you want to invest in a company that hides its cybersecurity incidents?

Efforts like this amendment would undermine transparency and provide investors with less useful information regarding material cybersecurity events.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I respectfully disagree with both the premise and the impact my colleague has represented here.

We have multiple lines of effort when it comes to protecting cybersecurity, particularly for Americans in our small and medium businesses in this area.

First and foremost, the Department of Homeland Security has primacy on this issue. When there is a violation, the Department of Justice must be informed. When we have CISA who lays out the requirements for reporting standards and then we have unelected individuals at the SEC who weigh on top of this with new regulations that are actually in conflict, we find ourselves not only confusing the issue but exposing some of our most sensitive information to our adversaries.

We have seen time and time again the threat imposed by foreign actors who look at what we are doing and disclosing as a way to attack us. They are using it not only as a model but as a playbook to go after us.

Let's secure our cybersecurity and ensure that our investors and our cyber hygiene are protected before we rampanantly put out in the public space information which could truly harm national security.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support a strong cybersecurity hygiene in this space, hold the SEC accountable, and support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. NUNN OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to approve the proposed rule of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board titled “Proposing Release: Amendments to PCAOB Auditing Standards related to a Company’s Non-compliance with Laws and Regulations; And Other Related Amendments” (published June 6, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I rise today, like many of my colleagues, to offer an amendment to push back on yet another ill-informed and arguably reckless proposal.

This amendment, which I am proud to co-lead with the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Mrs. WAGNER, is a straightforward amendment to protect businesses in States like mine in Iowa and many communities across America and to mitigate harm to investors at every level.

This amendment would prohibit unelected bureaucrats at the SEC from using funds in this legislation to require a small business to be forced to consider unrelated external factors as they review financial statements.

Like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I agree that preventing fraud and maintaining financial reporting integrity is essential to U.S. capital markets. However, this proposal is unnecessary and extremely burdensome. If passed, it would divert valuable resources away from a business’ principle responsibility to rigorously evaluate financial statements and make every auditor into some kind of pseudo attorney, a situation no small business can afford.

Small businesses are already the subject of highly complex and often technical laws and regulations that both Federal, State, and even local authorities impose upon them. The vague and complex language included in this pro-

posal creates ambiguity that would only lead to adverse outcomes for U.S. businesses, including increased legal and compliance costs for all that ultimately are passed on to everyday Americans.

In fact, estimates report that this proposal could triple the annual costs for public companies to the tune of more than \$55 billion per year.

Mr. Chair, I came to Congress, like so many in this room, to be able to serve my constituents and to roll back the type of bureaucracy and bureaucratic requirements that are crushing everyday Main Street businesses in my hometown and towns like it across Iowa by an imposed, non-elected person somewhere in Washington who sits behind a desk and writes these regulations with no consideration of the impact to hometown America. We do ourselves a disservice.

With this amendment, I believe it is a step forward to fulfilling so many of our commitments that we share on both the left and the right, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is an amendment that would block the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s proposal to strengthen standards for public company auditors to more proactively identify, evaluate, and communicate a company’s non-compliance with laws and rules.

Why in the world wouldn’t we want to warn investors about scofflaw companies?

The PCAOB’s proposal will increase auditor vigilance against fraud and general noncompliance with laws and regulations. Steps like these would encourage companies to take more timely action to remediate issues and reduce harm to investors.

This amendment would represent a significant setback to PCAOB’s commonsense efforts to combat fraud. Let’s protect investors. I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Chair, like the roughly 80 percent of businesses that commented on this proposal, I would have to respectfully disagree with my Democratic colleague.

We have a folklore hero in the heartland called Will Rogers. He says: You should write your Member of Congress frequently, because even if they don’t read it, they will at least know there is a problem out there.

We have heard back overwhelmingly from individuals who are operators in this space. The feedback highlights the

imperative in evaluating the effectiveness of any rule and striking the right balance between not only fraud prevention and audit quality but by preserving the essential financial reporting duties, something that they have been doing ardently for years.

The PCAOB has failed to engage in a productive dialogue with so many not only in my district but across the country on this critical matter to take into account the detrimental impact that it is going to have to small businesses across America.

While I respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I would urge them to consider all the good work that is already being done in this area and ask that the PCAOB do its job and start listening to Americans and implementing exercises that will assist, not regulations that will terminate.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1745

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce any COVID-19 mask mandates.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the funds appropriated by this act from being used to enforce any COVID-19 mask mandates.

I was fortunate enough to introduce this amendment during both the Energy and Water as well as the Interior appropriations, and I am happy to do it again today.

That being said, we are in the post-COVID world. People are educated on masks and whether or not they want to use them. Instead of imposing this type of mandate on individuals, let’s trust their judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my colleague and friend.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. OGLE’s amendment, which will prohibit

the funds from being used to institute mask mandates.

Mr. Chairman, when President Biden admitted that there is no Federal solution to COVID-19, he admitted that the mask and vaccine mandates were never about public health, they were about control.

Placing mask mandates on the American people and dictating that they must comply, or else, runs contrary to our commitment to America. Let's not forget that throughout the entire pandemic Democrats ignored their own masking rules while forcing children to wear them at school, and even outside on extremely hot days.

Liberal elites were spotted without their masks at hair salons, fancy restaurants, and more. Those same hypocritical leaders shamed others who did not comply with the mask mandates that they ignored.

The American people see right through Democrats' masking political theater and will never forget how they played politics with our children by shuttering their schools and masking their faces, even as doctors were noting the harm those mandates were causing our children.

As a pharmacist, I trust patients to work with medical professionals and their families to make healthcare decisions that work best for them.

A decision to receive a vaccine or wear a mask is a personal one and should only be done in consultation with a trusted healthcare professional.

That is why we need policies that empower workers to work, allows children and families to thrive, and encourages patients to foster relationships with their healthcare providers. One-size-fits-all mandates are nothing short of government overreach in its most tyrannical form.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative OGLES for working on this amendment. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and oppose President Biden's unconstitutional mask mandates.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that there is probably no Member of this House happier than I am not to have to wear a mask this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is a useless amendment. The COVID public health emergency has ended. This is water over the dam. We should stop wasting the House's time on useless amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I would point out with mask mandates, that includes any mask that can be utilized or worn. As to N-95 masks, the gold standard of masking, it was pointed out in The New York Times opinion piece by

epidemiologist, Tom Jefferson, that masks did not show as an effective means to blocking the virus.

Mr. Chairman, I ask adoption of this amendment. I ask my colleagues and my friends from the other side to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau entitled "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)" and published on May 31, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 35150).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds to implement or enforce the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule titled: "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act." Mr. Chairman, that is a mouthful.

Mr. Chairman, I would argue the CFPB is unconstitutional and should not exist. They should not be making this rule. The CFPB's final rule implementing section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Act, requires lenders to report data on small business loan applications, including applications from minority-owned, women-owned and LGBTQ-owned small businesses. This is information that is private to them and should have no bearing on creditworthiness, but rather is an intrusion into their privacy.

There is no reason why the government should be requiring the collection and disclosure of this information. There is no reason why money should be allocated to enforce this rule.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would hinder efforts to promote transparency and accountability in

small business lending and create hurdles for lenders and community organizations working to help women-owned businesses and minority-owned businesses access capital.

The CFPB's rulemaking would provide small business owners, lenders, and the public with critical information about the \$1.7 trillion small business financing market.

This amendment would harm all those who stand to benefit from this expanded transparency and accountability.

Small businesses are the engines of our American economy. Congress should not take action such as this amendment to hurt their ability to prosper.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I respect and appreciate my colleague's comments. I would point out that the CFPB, which I would argue, is an unconstitutional bogeyman for so many small American businesses. They want to force lenders to report data from women-owned businesses.

In the committee hearing, I asked Mr. Chopra: What is a woman? He couldn't answer the question. He chose not to answer the question.

I would argue, how is this information and data even reliable when they can't define what a woman is.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of those situations that in the name of transparency the government is collecting more information, information that they don't need in order to warrant or grant creditworthiness.

There is a point at which you stop collecting data. There is a point at which you have an obligation to protect the consumer, especially when you look at all the data breaches that our government and banks have had over and over again.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his comments, and I respect his opinion.

Mr. Chair, I would urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule titled

“Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles” (88 Fed. Reg. 63862 (September 18, 2023)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, our Republic depends on our bureaucracies faithfully implementing the laws and policies set forth by our elected officials.

A misguided rule proposed by the Office of Personnel Management could threaten a President’s ability to ensure that the executive branch is appropriately staffed to carry out his or her policies.

During the Trump administration, some career Federal employees were either unwilling to appropriately carry out President Trump’s agenda or, maybe more often, found themselves ill-equipped to make, implement, or communicate policies with which they disagreed.

All Presidents, Republican or Democrat, have this problem to some degree. They have a right to staff their offices.

President Biden now, outrageously, finds himself facing resistance by State Department employees who disagree with his opposition to Hamas.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that we allow this amendment to pass. It empowers a President, regardless of policy, regardless of party, to do their job to staff their offices.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

A nonpartisan civil service ensures Federal agencies carry out their missions with professionalism, safeguards the rule of law over partisanship, and ensures continuity between Presidential administrations.

This didn’t use to be a dispute in Washington, D.C. There was a clear, longstanding bipartisan consensus behind these principles until the previous administration attempted to undermine statutory merit-based protections for Federal civil servants.

Their effort would have moved tens of thousands of career Federal employees to a new job classification that would remove their employment protections.

This amendment seeks to block the Office of Personnel Management’s efforts to uphold these vital protections and works to undermine the integrity of a merit-based, nonpartisan civil service.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a “no” vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his comments.

We have civil service protections to protect career Federal employees from being fired or demoted just because the President or their supervisor disagrees with them politically. We must allow an administration the flexibility to decide that certain people are a bad fit for certain key roles and to let them transfer people so that the role can be filled with someone better suited for it. That is all we are asking. That is all this does.

To accomplish this, the Trump administration created schedule F, which identified positions that had a “confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character,” and provided that the administration could change who served in those specific roles to make sure that they were willing and able to advance the agenda the President chose to pursue.

This would apply to Biden. This would apply to Trump. This would have applied to Obama—regardless of party.

My amendment simply defunds a Biden rule that blocks Presidents from using a similar policy in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would block the Biden administration’s proposed rule titled: “Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles,” which would help prevent any future administration from reinstating the so-called schedule F.

The gentleman who is the author of this amendment says all we are asking for is flexibility. Balderdash. We already know that the Trump putative Presidency in exile have plans for moving 50,000 Federal employees initially into this new schedule F not authorized by Congress.

That is not flexibility. That is gutting civil service protection that has been in place since the 1880s. Congress created by statute a politics-free professional cadre of Federal employment to protect Federal employees and the public from the previous corrupt spoil system and political interference of President after President, irrespective of party.

Going back to that system is an enormous step backward and a huge disservice to Federal employees and to the public they serve and we serve.

□ 1800

If we are going to do this, then Congress has to be consulted. No President should have the unilateral authority to create a new profound schedule for the civil service. If it was created by statute, then a change to it this profound must also be heard by Congress and acted on by statute.

Schedule F would be a destructive instrument at the whim of any Presi-

dent. The gentleman says: Well, Obama could have had it if this were in place.

So could Trump and so could Biden. That is the problem. No President should have this kind of breathtaking power. I think the time is ripe for Congress to stand up for its own prerogatives and protect the original legislation creating a nonpartisan political service and protect the Federal employees who serve our public.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I would argue that it is time that Congress empowers any President to be able to staff their office, and if they have a member of their administration who is undermining their policies that they are able to—and it is not that we are saying to fire these individuals. It is a matter of putting them in another role where they are better suited so the President can carry forward on their policies.

It is my understanding that we have people within Biden’s own administration who don’t agree with him on policy. That is not their call. That is the President’s call. That is the call of Congress. So this is empowering the President, the administrative office, to be able to run more like a business.

Mr. Chairman, I ask adoption of this amendment. I think it is good, sound policy, and it puts a check and balance in place on career politicians who are more focused on their agenda than serving Congress or serving the President.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 85 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 86 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule titled “Registry of Nonbank Covered Persons Subject to Certain Agency and Court Orders” published by the Bureau of

Consumer Financial Protection in the Federal Register on January 30, 2023 (88 FR 6088).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the CFPB's rule entitled "Registry of Nonbank Covered Persons Subject to Certain Agency and Court Orders."

Mr. Chairman, there is a recurring theme here. That is because the CFPB is unconstitutional and their funding is unconstitutional. I would hope and expect the Supreme Court to rule in that way so that Congress can rule and administer funds appropriately.

That being said, we have an obligation to rein in their out-of-control regulation.

The CFPB's proposed rule seeks to publicly identify so-called repeat financial law offenders by establishing a database of enforcement actions taken against certain nonbank covered entities.

Specifically, the proposed rule would require certain nonbank entities to register with the bureau and to provide regular updates on such covered orders.

The proposed rule also includes obtaining enforcement actions against organizations that have already settled with State or local authorities.

Mr. Chairman, this is empowering an agency that has already gone too far. It has gone beyond its mandate, it is unconstitutional, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, Congress gave the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB, the job of ensuring that consumer protection laws are enforced consistently and that companies do not engage in unfair, deceptive, or abusive practices.

The statute is clear that this authority extends to oversight of nonbank companies that offer financial services or products.

Consistent with its mission of protecting consumers from abusive practices, the CFPB's nonbank registry will provide increased transparency over this sector and deter bad behavior. This amendment would stymie the CFPB's important effort on behalf of consumers and block the agency from preventing abusive practices by nonbanks that offer Financial Services or products.

Congress has to focus its attention on strengthening consumer protections for working people and investors, preventing companies from charging junk fees, and supporting enforcement to crack down on unscrupulous behavior. These are things we should be doing.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, the CFPB is essentially orchestrating a name-and-shame scheme with this registry, and it is openly weaponizing the power of the Federal Government to target market participants.

It could be weaponized, and it could be leveraged. So if they don't like how you operate, Mr. Chairman, if you are not woke enough, or if you are not green enough, then they can put on a registry.

To be clear, the CFPB does not have the authority to promulgate a robust set of registration requirements, nor does it have the authority to establish a database for a particular category of information. Such a registry will result in cost compliances and measures for covered nonbank entities, many of which are small businesses.

We are hearing this from the banking sector and from the adjacent sectors as well that the cost of compliance, because of the CFPB and because of the rulemaking, is off the charts. Ultimately, the consumer pays that cost.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague. Obviously, I ask that this amendment be adopted and ultimately that the CFPB be dismantled.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize the proposed rule entitled "Miscellaneous and General Requirements" (87 Fed. Reg. 78014 (December 21, 2022)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds to finalize the Federal Labor Relations Authority's proposed rule which would restrict Federal employees' ability to opt out of membership in a labor union.

I am not against the union, per se, but the right for someone to opt out. They should have that right.

In its Janus decision, the Supreme Court affirmed that government employees have a First Amendment right to retain their jobs while choosing to abstain from funding or participating in a public-sector union.

However, the Federal Labor Relations Authority has proposed a rule to violate the intention of that ruling.

First, it restricts Federal employees to a limited window each calendar year to opt out of having union dues deducted from their paychecks. Then, preposterously, it requires agencies to assume that employees who have already opted out of paying dues want to resume paying dues in the future, which requires the employee to then opt out again.

This is not the intent of the Supreme Court decision. The employees should be empowered and not basically hemmed in by a regulatory rule.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I claim the time in opposition, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Labor Relations Authority's proposed changes to rules around how and when Federal employees can cancel payments of their union dues merely restores a longstanding policy about dues payments that had been in place since 1981.

The policy merely establishes that employees may opt out of their union dues payments during a certain time period each year.

Under this longstanding procedure, Federal employees who choose to join their agency's union are made aware of the annual dues revocation period. Every year some members choose to revoke their membership and cease paying dues, a fair process that has worked well for decades.

This amendment would block these decades-old rules and introduce less stability, less financial security, and less predictability for Federal employee unions.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to point out in its Janus decision, the Supreme Court affirmed that employees have a First Amendment right to opt out. The decision didn't say that the employee has a First Amendment right 1 month out of the year. It said that they have the right.

This rule is unreasonable in that it requires an employee, if they need or decide they want to opt out, to wait 11 months. That is not what the decision says.

Mr. Chairman, you have a First Amendment right to say no.

Furthermore, once you have opted out, why, then can the union then ignore your First Amendment right and opt you back in the following year?

That is not the intent of this decision, and it is not our obligation to ensure the stability of a union. Moreover,

this decision was to protect the rights of workers.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLE. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 88 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the “Federal Supplier Climate Risks and Resilience Proposed Rule”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 269, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment No. 89 will prohibit any funds made available in this act from being used to enforce the Federal supplier climate risks and resilience proposed rule.

This rule is part of the Biden administration’s plan for the Federal Government to reach net-zero procurement.

The rule seeks to impose impractical and overly burdensome climate reporting standards on large- and medium-sized government contractors of which small businesses make up 29 percent and 64 percent respectively.

Climate and emissions standards should not be integrated into financial reporting, especially for the small businesses who lack the resources to meet these environmentalists’ extreme standards.

These government contractors play a critical role in providing essential goods and services such as weapons systems to our military and the very uniforms that they wear. Wool from Montana is used in the design and the production of our Army uniforms.

Currently, only 10 percent of medium-sized contractors and 31 percent

of large contractors disclose their GHG emissions.

These reporting requirements represent a substantial burden, especially for contractors who lack the infrastructure to collect emissions data. To comply with these overly burdensome regulations, these small businesses will be required to invest significant amounts of time, money, and manpower to establish entirely new emissions reporting regimes. Such an endeavor will be financially crippling for many of them.

As Congress, we should ensure that the best companies for the job are the ones who get the contract, not just massive government contractors who can produce time-consuming reports. We should not be imposing these impractical emissions reporting standards on any businesses, particularly on the family ranches that produce our military uniforms.

This amendment is about ensuring that our government remains impartial and does not become a platform for large corporations to stifle competition.

□ 1815

We must champion true and fair competition within the government contract space, promoting economic fairness and a level playing field over an environmentalist agenda.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, which aims to protect the interests of small businesses and uphold the principles of fairness, competitiveness, and financial responsibility.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment blocks an important rule requiring major Federal contractors to publicly disclose their greenhouse gas emissions and climate-related financial risks and sets science-based emissions reduction targets.

The Federal Government is the world’s single-largest buyer of goods and services, purchasing over \$630 billion in the last fiscal year alone. Accordingly, the rule recognizes that the Federal Government also faces significant financial risks from climate change.

This amendment would have us bury our heads in the sand, ignore the Federal Government’s exposure to climate change impacts, and prevent us from working toward commonsense climate goals. For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, just so everybody understands, this proposed rule from the Biden administration re-

quires major contractors to annually disclose scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions and to establish science-based target requirements.

Let me tell you what scope 1 is: greenhouse gas emissions from sources that are owned or controlled by the reporting entity. If I am raising wool, am I supposed to follow around behind each and every sheep that runs through the pasture to check the flatulence that they are releasing from their derrieres? This is absolutely ridiculous, and this is the kind of thing that the other side of the aisle is requiring.

I am not going to the south end of a northbound sheep to try to find out how much is being emitted.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I think that we have very quickly demonstrated how ridiculous this standard is, and I hope that all of my colleagues support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purchase or construction of any new Federal building in Washington, D.C.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, my amendment No. 90 would prohibit any funds made available by this act from being used for the purchase or construction of any new Federal building in Washington, D.C.

Our Nation is over \$33 trillion in debt, with an expected annual deficit this year of nearly \$2 trillion. We need to find innovative ways to reduce this spending.

The Federal Government spends approximately \$25 billion annually to operate, maintain, or lease over 278,000 buildings. Some Realtors out there are getting very wealthy managing these properties.

A recent GAO report found that, in early 2023, well past COVID at-home working, two-thirds of Federal agencies used a mere 25 percent or less of

their space at headquarters. You cannot keep vacancy rates like that on any commercial enterprise and stay in business.

The same report also found that, on the higher range, agencies used an estimated 39 to 49 percent of the capacity of their headquarters.

The Federal Government wastes billions of taxpayer dollars to own and maintain buildings and barely uses them. This is unacceptable, and quite frankly, it is an insult to the taxpayers of Montana. Moreover, having all of our Federal agencies in Washington, D.C., makes them less accountable to the American people.

One of President Trump's accomplishments was moving the Bureau of Land Management headquarters to Colorado. Agencies should be close to the constituents where their actions have the biggest impact. Unfortunately, Secretary Haaland reversed course and moved the BLM's headquarters back to Washington, D.C. If the BLM was still headquartered in Colorado, maybe Director Stone-Manning would be more accessible to the constituents whom her disastrous rules have harmed.

Our Nation is trillions in debt and wastes billions on underutilized Federal buildings. No organization can operate this way successfully. The status quo must change. My commonsense amendment would simply prohibit funds for constructing or purchasing new buildings in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would block the construction of Federal buildings in Washington, D.C., and with all due respect to the gentleman from Montana, it is based on a fundamental misconception. It is not like these projects go up at the whim of the administration. Buildings have to have appropriated funding, and there is a prospectus process on the authorizing side.

This is a misguided amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, let me reiterate this again: Two-thirds of Federal agencies used 25 percent or less of their space at headquarters. This was not during the peak of COVID when we had a lot of people working from home. This is a report that the GAO just produced in 2023.

We have vacant buildings. People are probably wandering around there, wondering what the echo sound is.

In January 2023, at a meeting of the Federal Real Property Council, more than half of the agency officials acknowledged that their headquarters buildings had excess space prior to the pandemic.

Mr. Chair, we have too much real estate. We need to liquidate some of these assets. We need to get some of those buildings off the books. Then, we can have a conversation about where new construction can take place.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment would prohibit the use of funds in this bill for the purchase or construction of any new building in the District of Columbia. The purchase or construction of new Federal buildings can save taxpayers money and improve government operations.

The ongoing consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security's headquarters at St. Elizabeth's in the District of Columbia is a prime example of how new construction can result in significant savings for taxpayers.

The Department is currently housed in more than 50 separate locations throughout the national capital region, and 79 percent of those leases will expire in the next 5 years. Consolidating the Department at St. Elizabeth's will reduce the Department's leasing portfolio and costs by at least 20 percent in accordance with the Reduce the Footprint policy of the General Services Administration as required by Congress and is estimated to result in \$1.17 billion in savings.

If this amendment were adopted, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the Office of Intelligence and Analysis would be forced to extend expensive short-term leases at significant taxpayer cost.

The consolidation of the Department at St. Elizabeth's is important for streamlining operations and coordination among key Department agencies and offices.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for the Consumer Prod-

uct Safety Commission is hereby reduced by 50 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, my amendment No. 91 would reduce funding to the Commission by 50 percent, saving American taxpayers approximately \$69 million. This does not include the savings from the unnecessary regulations on the industry and the obligation that the regulatory state has created on them.

The Biden-appointed CPSC Commissioners began talking about banning gas stoves this past January. After major pushback, the Chair of the CPSC said that they weren't looking into a ban on gas stoves. However, the Biden administration still moved forward with the Department of Energy rule on gas stove emissions.

I was proud to vote for Representative KELLY ARMSTRONG's Gas Stove Protection and Freedom Act in June, and I am pleased that the base text of this bill includes a provision to protect Americans from unserious and invasive emissions standards.

However, this ordeal has led me to lose any confidence in the Consumer Product Safety Commission, which should probably not exist in the first place and should only issue recommendations.

These unelected bureaucrats get paid to work out of a beltway office and decide what products Americans can buy. It is time to rein them in. American people and businesses should be the ones making those decisions. If there is a particularly egregious product, consumers have legal recourse, and Congress can step in and make a law. It shouldn't be done by unaccountable bureaucrats who are invested in keeping themselves employed by continuing to overregulate products.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

For more than 50 years, the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission has worked to fulfill its statutory mission to protect the public against unreasonable risk of injuries and deaths associated with consumer products.

By cutting the CPSC's budget by half, this amendment would gut the agency's staff and undermine its mission.

It is an extreme measure that would place children, families, and communities around the country at greater risk of injury and death from product

hazards. This amendment would leave consumers vulnerable to products that pose a fire, electrical, chemical, or mechanical hazard or that can injure children.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, besides trying to ban gas stoves, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has also proposed other ridiculous rules.

For example, on October 25, 2023—not the early 1900s, 2023—the Commission proposed a rule on furnaces that states: The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission has determined preliminarily that there is an unreasonable risk of injury and death associated with residential gas-fired central furnaces, boilers, wall furnaces, and floor furnaces.

This is all gas furnaces and boilers.

□ 1830

Let’s get to the crux of this. This agency is trying to put the natural fuels that we have in our country out of business. This is another ploy by the Biden administration to drive us all to this broken idea of relying upon renewable energy. It is not realistic. This is just another agency that is trying to perpetuate that, and they do not need more money to attack the American people and American industries.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, under the legal theory espoused by the Commission, all manufacturers and retailers would be liable for injuries caused by consumers’ negligence or even intentional misuse of a safe product, even when the manufacturer provided warnings and instructions on safe use. This is nothing more than a trial attorney’s dream come true. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. ROSENDALE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Office of Gun Violence Prevention in the Executive Office of the President.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, my amendment No. 92 would prohibit funding for President Biden’s new Office of Gun Violence Prevention.

Since President Biden took office in January of 2021, our Second Amendment rights have been under assault. Now, with the stroke of a pen, President Biden created the Office of Gun Violence Prevention, allowing his administration to bypass Congress unilaterally and implement the left’s gun control agenda.

This office would be overseen by Vice President KAMALA HARRIS and staffed with radical former gun control lobbyists, allowing the swamp to have total control of Biden’s gun control agenda.

In Montana, 64 percent of the households have firearms. Montanans will not go along with the White House’s attempt to undermine our Second Amendment rights.

People often say, what are they afraid of out there in Montana? Why do they need so many firearms? I will tell you, we are not afraid of anything, and it is because we do have our firearms.

It is unacceptable for the hard-earned tax dollars of gun owners in Montana to fund the salaries of unelected, gun-grabbing bureaucrats who are hell-bent on branding law-abiding, responsible gun owners as criminals.

My amendment would throw a wrench in the gun control lobbyists’ plans and severely hamper the Biden administration’s ability to impose further restrictions on our Second Amendment rights. It is time we drained the swamp and kicked the gun control lobby out of the White House. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this senseless amendment.

The White House gun violence task force is committed to treating gun violence as the public health crisis it is. By approaching this issue from a public health perspective, the task force aims to reduce the staggering number of deaths and injuries caused by firearms in the United States.

The task force emphasizes the importance of data-driven and evidence-based policy decisions that will create solutions that balance the rights of law-abiding gun owners with the need for public safety.

Mr. Chair, as a gun owner myself, I tell you that task force seeks to enact commonsense gun safety measures that

the majority of Americans support. These include: background checks for all gun sales, closing the gun show and online sale loopholes, and implementing red flag laws temporarily to disarm individuals who pose a danger to themselves or others.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a “no” vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, as I have referenced, Vice President HARRIS possesses no special credentials to run the Office of Gun Violence Prevention and will act as nothing more than a figurehead. The office will rely on left-wing special interests and lobbyists to enact the Democrats’ war on the Second Amendment while also rewarding President Biden’s donors with cushy jobs at the White House.

Rob Wilcox, the Deputy Director of the Office of Gun Violence Prevention, led Federal policy at Everytown for Gun Safety, which is primarily financed by Michael Bloomberg. All the time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to undermine and compromise our Second Amendment rights, they fail to recognize the prosecutors that they have put in place around the country that refuse to charge and prosecute the criminals that should not have guns, that have been doing crimes with illegal firearms. That is where the focus needs to be. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment to eliminate the White House Office of Gun Violence Prevention, which President Biden took historic action to create.

This year, there have been more shootings than days in the year. It has been a deadly year, and that is why the American people want to see us take action, not tear down the simple efforts they are owed.

However, my colleagues aren’t listening to the American people. They are listening to the gun manufacturers. They are listening to the gun lobby, the gun lobby that emailed everyone about this amendment that we are debating right now, saying they would endorse against any politician who votes with common sense. It was an email filled with pure hyperbole saying that this office was made to take guns away.

This office is not created to take guns away, it is created to save lives. The American people fear for their safety, and that should be more important than Republican politicians’ fear for their careers.

How many more dreams need to be extinguished until we say enough is enough?

The swamp radicals that we are referring to are people like Greg Jackson, a survivor of gun violence who was shot not too far from this Chamber and fought for his life in the hospital. He

almost died due to senseless gun violence, and he has committed his life to saving all of our lives. I am offended that someone would call him or Rob Wilcox, another survivor of gun violence, the swamp.

The White House Office of Gun Violence Prevention will save lives, and voting “no” means trying to eliminate a FEMA-like response for communities after shootings and the coordination of gun violence prevention programs that will save lives.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, again, what my colleagues fail to recognize time and time again is the fact that we have so much crime that takes place, criminal on criminal, or criminals committing these crimes and an innocent victim gets tied up in the crossfire.

They also refuse to recognize that these communities and cities that are led by Democrat leaders have had increased crime rates over the last several years since the Biden administration has taken over, and that is because they have prosecutors who are not charging and prosecuting these criminals and letting them off without proper punitive measures taking place.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will make this about criminal-on-criminal activity. One of the core tenets of this office is for community violence intervention, one of the only such programs in our country that go into communities, find out people who are most likely to shoot someone, and people who are most likely to be shot, create relationships, and intervene before the violence happens. This office is working to solve exactly the problem that was just iterated by the other side.

I hope if my colleagues follow their own logic that they will vote “no” on this amendment so we can save lives across the entire country.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, forgive me if I don’t trust a Federal agency to be policing a community and using their discretion about who may or may not be committing a crime in the future.

My gosh, we have just witnessed the FBI conducting surveillance on Catholics because they were attending Latin masses.

We watched them conduct surveillance on parents because they dared attempt to attend school board meetings.

Now we are going to unleash the Federal agencies to conduct surveillance on people who might own a firearm, who may not own a firearm, who might commit a crime in the future, and they are going to be the sole judge of that?

The people across Montana will not support that. They will not tolerate that, and this amendment deems to get rid of an agency that is trying to do those exact kinds of acts.

I ask my colleagues to please support this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 93 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including titles IV and VIII, may be used to carry out section 3a of the Immunization of School Students Act of 1979 (sec. 38-502.01, D.C. Official Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, the amendment that I am offering would prohibit the District of Columbia from using Federal funding to require that elementary or secondary school students take the COVID-19 vaccine and all the boosters to attend school.

In 2021, the D.C. City Council voted to create an unscientific mandate that D.C. students be fully vaccinated against COVID-19 including boosters. It was repeatedly delayed, as the parents of more than 40 percent of children over 12 in D.C. decided the COVID-19 vaccine was not worth the risks and declined to get vaccinated.

Today, the mandate would keep 73 percent of all D.C. students between the ages of 12 and 17 out of classrooms.

Now, the issue here, obviously, is twofold. One is whether Congress should have a role in impacting policy choices in the District of Columbia, which the Constitution clearly contemplates.

In fact, the District of Columbia is not a State. It was not designed to be a State. It is not going to be a State because the District of Columbia was set up in our Constitution to be our National Capital, by design, very specifically.

One of the things that we are able to do as a Congress is effect policy in the

District of Columbia, whereas we are not supposed to intervene for the most part in the laboratories of democracy among the States. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle never find any limit to their ability to want to interject into the States.

One of the things we can do in D.C. is try to impact policy here. Now, the fact is, these vaccine mandates were completely ineffective; and, in fact, they were destructive. The CDC’s own website states that when cases have occurred, they have most frequently been seen in adolescent and young adult males.

The Pfizer website states myocarditis and pericarditis have occurred in some people who have received the vaccine, more commonly in adolescent males.

The FDA has placed a warning label on both the Moderna and Pfizer vaccines. I could go on and on with the evidence and the indication of the concerns these mandates have on freedom and, importantly, our children.

Now, obviously, the rule for this was passed before yesterday when the D.C. City Council unanimously voted to repeal this unscientific mandate.

□ 1845

There is not some vast Republican conspiracy afoot in D.C. The Department of Health, Office of State Superintendent of Education, and the Deputy Mayor of Education each testified in favor of repealing the vaccine mandate.

What we are doing here in offering this is making clear that it is the position of the United States Congress who is constitutionally charged with ensuring that the District of Columbia is managed appropriately is no longer foisting upon the children who live in the Nation’s Capital a, frankly, intrusive and harmful vaccine mandate, and it should not continue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. This amendment would prohibit the District of Columbia from using its local funds to carry out the section of D.C.’s Immunization of School Students Act of 1979 that required students to receive a COVID-19 vaccine.

D.C. has already repealed this section. While the repeal of the section expires on January 23, 2024, yesterday the D.C. Council passed legislation that would permanently repeal this section.

Nevertheless, how D.C. spends its local funds, which consist of local taxes and fees, should be a decision for D.C., not Congress.

If D.C.’s locally elected officials want to spend local D.C. funds to carry out COVID-19 vaccine requirements for students, they should have the authority to do so.

If they do not want to spend D.C.'s local funds to carry out COVID-19 vaccine requirements for students, they should have the authority not to do so.

D.C.'s locally elected officials are accountable to D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like the decisions of their locally elected officials, they can vote them out of office.

D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable of governing themselves. If House Republicans cared about democratic principles or D.C. residents, they would bring my D.C. statehood bill, which would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government, to this floor.

Congress has the constitutional authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. It simply lacks the will.

I say to every Member of Congress: Keep your hands off D.C. If you want to legislate on local D.C. matters, become a D.C. resident and get elected Mayor or councilmember.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, in March of this year President Biden signed legislation that we moved through this body overturning the criminal code revisions of the D.C. City Council that reduced the maximum penalties for burglary, carjacking, and robbery.

Our own colleague, the gentleman from Texas, was carjacked at gunpoint nine blocks from where we are right here.

The fact of the matter is D.C. needs continued oversight from this body. I am glad that we acted and passed that legislation and forced change to the code, and I am glad that President Biden signed it.

What we are doing here is not just academic. I understand the D.C. City Council acted yesterday, but it is important for this body, for the House of Representatives, to make clear that the students in this country should not be subjected to mandatory vaccine mandates that undermine their health through pseudoscience.

We have an obligation to ensure that we are ensuring that Nation's Capital is doing the right thing, and, frankly, we have the ability to influence that in ways we should not when interfering directly with the laboratories of democracy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any of the following Executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13990, relating to Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis.

(2) Executive Order 14008, relating to Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad.

(3) Section 6 of Executive Order 14013, relating to Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration.

(4) Executive Order 14030, relating to Climate-Related Financial Risk.

(5) Executive Order 14057, relating to Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability.

(6) Executive Order 14082, relating to Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

(7) Executive Order 14096, relating to Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, the amendment that I am offering here prohibits any of the funding in the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act from being used to carry out President Biden's executive orders on climate change.

This is something I have been offering in each of the appropriations bills because I believe that the implications of the President's executive orders on climate change are significant.

They are undermining our well-being. They are undermining the prosperity of American citizens. They are harming the economy. They are driving up inflation. They are minimizing options for the people of this country to go about doing their jobs. They are driving up the price of energy. They are making cars more expensive. They are making homes more expensive.

You wonder why we have high inflation? Look no further than the radical environmental policies of my Democratic colleagues.

In September, the Department of the Treasury issued its "Principles for Net-Zero Financing & Investment," which highlighted best practices for net-zero commitments and approaches to implementing them.

The SEC has proposed rules to force all public companies to report on their emissions and all the emissions in their value chains. The bill defunds that.

The IRS is implementing the vast majority of \$1.2 trillion in climate subsidies included in the IRA—again, \$1.2 trillion in climate subsidies included in the IRA.

The goal is clear: Force divestment from oil and gas—one of our largest geopolitical assets, one of our strongest blessings from the good Lord that this country has to be able to stand

independently, energy independent, and to be able to have a significant force in the world.

These orders have directed the General Services Administration to overhaul the Federal building portfolio and vehicle fleet.

Each agency's light-duty vehicle acquisitions shall be zero-emission vehicles by the end of fiscal year 2027. Each agency shall achieve net-zero emissions across its portfolio of buildings, campuses, and installations by 2045 and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50 percent.

This rapid overhaul of the Federal footprint should concern everyone. We are going to make our Federal vehicle fleet dependent on an EV supply chain that is 90 percent dominated by China.

Eight of the ten largest solar equipment makers are headquartered in China, and 10 of the 15 largest wind equipment makers are Chinese.

The fact of the matter is the implementation of the President's executive orders undermines our national security, empowers our enemies, and undermines our ability to have a prosperous economy.

For that reason, I am glad it has been adopted in virtually every one of the appropriations bills that we have moved forward, and I hope that it will be here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Climate-related financial risks can have significant adverse economic impacts on businesses, communities, and the financial sector.

Come on. Addressing these risks is essential to safeguard economic stability and resilience, and these things are crucial in the face of a changing climate.

Financial institutions and Federal agencies ought to consider climate risks in their decisionmaking processes, particularly in investment and lending practices. By doing so, it promotes responsible and sustainable investment choices that support projects and businesses with low environmental impacts.

These executive orders underscore the importance of the United States taking a leadership role in global efforts to combat climate change. By setting ambitious domestic goals and engaging with international partners, the United States can encourage other countries to follow suit, resulting in a more effective global response to climate change. The United States should be leading this effort.

These executive orders are essential for combating climate change because they address climate-related financial risks, encourage responsible investment, promote global leadership, strengthen resilience, and accelerate the transition to clean energy.

They collectively contribute to a more comprehensive and effective approach to mitigating the impacts of climate change and advancing environmental sustainability.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I do urge a “no” vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says “come on” to my assertions about the damage that this causes, but I would just say come on with respect to the family that has to choose between fuel and food this month because that is what is happening.

It was the Secretary of Transportation who literally said earlier this year: The American people need to feel pain.

Now, imagine if the Secretary of Transportation, allegedly in charge of making sure we have roads and the ability for people to move around this country, engage in commerce, take care of their families, have a strong economy for our national security, for our well-being, our prosperity, imagine if that Secretary says to all of the families out there: Oh, I am sorry. Come on. Looks at them and says: Well, too bad. You have got to experience some pain, don’t you understand.

Never mind the 1,100 coal-fired plants in China compared to our 250. Never mind they have two a week they keep adding.

Never mind that if you eliminate the internal combustion engine, you are not going to dent CO₂ production around the world.

We are pursuing a radical agenda to the detriment of the American people, and they know it. They feel it. They see it every single day with the high price of gas, the high price of electricity, the increase in the cost of their homes, and the inability to buy goods and services that rely on that energy.

They see it every day in a world destabilized around the globe because we are not pushing out American energy, liquefied natural gas. We are not building nuclear power.

We are not doing all the things we could do to be significantly energy independent here using our resources to make sure that we are not buying into unicorn energy, undermining our national security and our prosperity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, this amendment is opposed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MS. SALAZAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 95 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 902. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to produce documents containing the term “latinx” or the term “latin-x”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would simply prohibit the executive branch from using the term “Latinx” in official public documents.

Although 98 percent of Latinos reject the term “Latinx,” the White House has made a point to continue referring to us, the Latinos, as “Latinx.”

Mr. Chair, let’s talk about the epidemic of wokeness in our community. Wokeness has taken over our schools and our children, and now it wants to take over the Hispanic culture.

The reality is that the Spanish language has two genders, masculine and feminine—male and female, period. There is no x.

A new generation wants to modify a universal Hispanic reality. It wants to erase a grammatical rule that has been place for centuries.

In 2004, the term “Latinx” first appeared online on Google Trends. It is supposed to signify a nonbinary option for Hispanics by removing the “a” for female or the “o” for male when addressing someone.

□ 1900

“Latinx” has been overwhelmingly rejected by the Hispanic community in this country. Only 2 percent of the Hispanic population uses the term “Latinx,” while 90 percent prefer to use “Hispanic” or “Latino.”

What we are seeing is that the use of “Latinx” is growing in university classrooms, where gender ideology and political correctness have taken over academics and intellectual rigor.

Listen to this. We are seeing the use of “Latinx” in government documents at a time when the people it refers to don’t even want to use it. How could that be? That is imposing on us. We don’t even want it.

That is why I have introduced this amendment to prohibit the Biden administration from using “Latinx” in official, public-facing government documents.

This is an important move that would prevent this wokeness from being forced onto us, the Hispanics, a conservative community that uses “male” and “female,” period.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to stand with the Latino community—“Latino” with an o and “Latina” with an a, not with an x. I urge them to choose our traditional Hispanic culture

over woke culture, to choose our history over political correctness to please a small group of people who don’t even know anything about us.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for 18F within Technology Transformation Services at the General Services Administration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, this past March, the inspector general of the General Services Administration issued a report into the identity verification and validation service Login.gov.

Login.gov is managed by the Technology Transformation Service within GSA and was built by a group called 18F, which lies within TTS and describes itself as a technology design consultancy for the U.S. Government.

Login.gov was intended to provide the public with a single website through which they can access digital services with a single username and password.

For agencies, it is supposed to ensure persons trying to access services are who they claim to be so that security and convenience are met.

What could go wrong? Well, the March IG report that I will include in the RECORD detailed how employees at Login.gov knowingly misrepresented the level of security they provided to their clients within the government. It even billed agency clients over \$10 million for services that they did not provide and for products that did not exist. Without getting too technical, Login.gov claimed that it offered a level of security that included biometric comparisons for applicants.

I realize there had been and still are concerns about the biometric comparisons returning false positives within

certain ethnic groups, but if there were these concerns, the proper way to deal with the situation was not to lie and say you provided a service that you did not, in fact, provide.

When the IG report came out, the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, which I was the chairman of at the time, held hearings into fraud in Federal programs. We heard how taxpayers had lost hundreds of billions of dollars to bad actors from the IRS, and a central tactic in such fraud was identity theft, which is at the very heart of what the 18F group is about.

Here we have a Federal entity marketing a service to Federal customers that is intended to assure identity, but that Federal entity is not telling the truth.

Mr. Chair, this amendment targets 18F. Why 18F and not Login.gov itself? Because since its inception in 2014, in the wake of the healthcare.gov debacle, trouble has followed 18F around. It was envisioned to be a tech-savvy group within the Federal Government that would bring a startup mentality and a high level of competence to help usher Federal agencies into the digital age. In practice, it has been more like a group run amok, a group run amok that intended to deceive people about what they were doing.

In 2016, the IG issued a report describing how 18F had run up a deficit of \$31 million between 2014 and the third quarter of 2016, even though it was supposed to generate enough revenue to cover its costs.

In 2017, the IG issued another report describing how 18F routinely circumvented fundamental security policies and guidelines established by our government.

In the 2023 report on Login.gov, the IG reported that despite the concerns raised in the two previous reports, the culture of 18F and its parent group, TTS, was still a problem. One Federal tech executive is quoted as saying about 18F that they came in to solve one problem and created two different problems.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment takes care of 18F by not allowing them to be funded. 18F has been in operation for over a decade, leaving a trail of expensive problems and questionable value.

The Committee on Oversight held a hearing on this. It was a bipartisan hearing. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle had an opportunity to talk about this, and we came up with this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. STEIL, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the staff legal bulletin entitled “Shareholder Proposals: Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14L (CF)” (published November 3, 2021).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, like so many amendments that I, along with many others, introduced today, this is an assault on the taxpayers and more bureaucratic red tape that they want the taxpayers to pay for.

Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to implement the SEC’s “Staff Legal Bulletin 14L,” also known as SLB 14L. This staff legal bulletin allows the SEC staff to open up a big loophole for activist proposals to the detriment of American workers and retirement savers.

It is either doing one or two things: paying staff twice or hiring staff to do something that was not anticipated by the SEC.

Traditionally, under rule 14a-8, public companies could request a no-action letter from the SEC allowing them to exclude shareholder proposals that are irrelevant to the company’s business.

The SLB, or staff legal bulletin, said they will not issue no-action letters if a proposal concerns an issue with a broad societal impact. I don’t even know what that is, “a broad societal impact.” Try defining that.

In other words, it doesn’t matter if a shareholder proposal is illegal or irrelevant to the company. If it is on a significant social policy issue of broad societal impact—whatever that is—it has to be considered.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SEC guidance that this rule would block provides clearer guidance for companies for disclosure of non-generally accepted accounting principles, non-GAAP. This clarity helps investors better understand a company’s financial performance, making investment decisions more informed. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, basically, what my friends on the opposite side of the aisle are saying is that investors are too stupid to know where

they put their money, if it is legitimate or not—get this—and they need help from staff judgments to decide which societal policy issues to prioritize. This is basically saying the American people are stupid.

Nobody should be surprised that this has led to a spike in ESG-related shareholder proposals.

Again, this political performance does not belong in the boardrooms. Companies should be governed to a maximum shareholder value on our retirement plans that should work toward healthy returns. I guess they are going to get the staff judgments to say if they are healthy returns or not.

Allowing the SEC to politicize the shareholders’ proposals hurts workers, retirement savers, and the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. STEIL, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule of the Securities and Exchange Commission entitled “Proxy Voting Advice” (87 Fed. Reg. 43168; published July 19, 2022).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, much like the previous amendment to stop the assault on the American taxpayer, I rise in support of this amendment to prohibit funds for the SEC’s 2022 proxy adviser rule.

By issuing this new rule, the Biden SEC gutted key safeguards from the previous administration. Those safeguards provided sorely needed accountability and transparency for the proxy adviser industry.

ISS and Glass Lewis, the two main proxy adviser firms, control 97 percent of the market for proxy advice. The businesses that manage our retirement savings rely on these firms when deciding how to vote on corporate governance issues.

The two that they rely on control 97 percent. They are the ones that have

the expertise, and to say anything different is just flatout wrong and not in reality.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SEC's 2022 proxy adviser rule promotes transparency and accountability by requiring proxy advisory firms to provide more disclosure about their methodologies, their potential conflicts of interest, and their engagement with issuers. This rule aims to improve the accuracy and reliability of proxy advisory recommendations, which play a crucial role in corporate governance.

The SEC's 2022 proxy adviser rule strikes a balance among the interests of issuers, investors, and proxy advisory firms.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I will close with the fact that, instead, this powerful duopoly is fueling a movement to weaponize your retirement funds to basically push a political agenda that this Biden administration has been so adamant on. Both firms often recommend in favor of harmful ESG measures and proposals that violate State or local law. They have a long track record of costly factual errors and uncontrolled conflicts of interest.

The 2022 Biden administration rule lets proxy advisers continue to push a political agenda and make bad recommendations. Our retirement savings should be geared toward higher returns and not political objectives.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. STEUBE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 118-269.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Communications Equity and Diversity Council at the Federal Communications Commission.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 847, the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, our Federal bureaucracy is riddled with wasteful and purposeless offices that do nothing but fuel the flames of divisiveness in our government.

Why is our Federal Government more concerned with advancing programs that fuel racism over the needs of the American people? These offices seek to treat people differently based on immutable characteristics like the color of their skin or their gender. That should be offensive to all of us in Congress.

Mr. Chair, my amendment would eliminate funding for the Communications Equity and Diversity Commission within the FCC. The mission of this woke DEI office is to advance "equity in the provision of and access to digital communication services." Further, it seeks to advance progressive priorities by elevating certain small businesses based merely on the race or gender of the businessowner.

Through the establishment of this council, it is clear that the FCC is working for special, politically favored groups instead of the American people as a whole.

We are already seeing the products of these DEI policies at the FCC through draft rules implementing an obscure provision of the 2021 infrastructure bill that directed the FCC to prevent "digital discrimination." Your guess is as good as mine as to what that has to do with infrastructure.

Democrats on the FCC seek to go beyond the plain letter of this law to define "digital discrimination" to include disparate impact as evidence of discrimination. This means that the FCC could find that internet providers are guilty of discrimination simply because some areas of the country have slightly better access to the internet than others, regardless of whether there is any evidence of actual, legitimate discrimination. Unfortunately, even our internet access is not immune to the scourge of DEI ideology.

Mr. Chair, these divisive DEI policies deserve no place in our Federal Government, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in rooting out this radical, progressive, and woke ideology.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Communications Equity and Diversity Council at the Federal Communications Commission, the FCC, is instrumental in promoting inclusivity within the organization. By championing diversity, it ensures that the

workforce represents a broader spectrum of perspectives, fostering a more inclusive and equitable workplace.

The council's existence improves decisionmaking at the FCC by incorporating diverse viewpoints. Diverse teams are more likely to generate innovative ideas, leading to better policies and regulations that benefit a wider range of people in the ever-evolving communications and technology sector.

The Communications Equity and Diversity Council also plays a crucial role in ensuring that the FCC complies with American law as well as ethical guidelines related to diversity and equity in employment.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, section 60506 of the IIJA mandates that the FCC develops a regulation to prevent digital discrimination of broadband access based on income level, race, ethnicity, color, religion, or national origin.

Progressive groups and FCC Democratic Commissioners want to use this provision to promulgate a regulation that goes beyond intentional discrimination. They want to include disparate impact as a form of discrimination under the rule.

Under a disparate impact analysis, evidence of discrimination can be found solely in the outcome of certain practices. Essentially, internet service providers would have to provide the same exact product at the same speed to every customer in order to avoid a potential government investigation. If there is even a small difference in connectivity in an area inhabited by low-income individuals in comparison with wealthier areas, the FCC could claim the provider is guilty of discrimination under the draft rules promoted by these progressive groups and FCC Democrats.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this very good amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4664) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 9 p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 847 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4664.

Will the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2101

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOYLAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-269 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 54 by Mr. GAETZ of Florida.

Amendment No. 63 by Mrs. HARSHBARGER of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 87 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 91 by Mr. ROSENDALE of Montana.

Amendment No. 92 by Mr. ROSENDALE of Montana.

Amendment No. 95 by Ms. SALAZAR of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 54, printed in part B of House Report 118-269 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

GAETZ), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 273, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

	[Roll No. 634]		
	AYES—145		
Aderholt	Gallagher	Moolenaar	Ferguson
Alford	Garcia, Mike	Mooney	Lee (NV)
Allen	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)	Lee (PA)
Amodei	Gooden (TX)	Moran	Fletcher
Armstrong	Gosar	Nehls	Flood
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Norman	Foster
Babin	Green (TN)	Ogles	Foushee
Baird	Greene (GA)	Owens	Frankel, Lois
Balderson	Griffith	Palmer	Frost
Banks	Grothman	Pence	Gallego
Bean (FL)	Guest	Perry	Garamendi
Bergman	Hageman	Pfluger	Garbarino
Biggs	Harris	Posey	Garcia (IL)
Bilirakis	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler	Garcia (TX)
Boebert	Hern	Rodgers (WA)	Garcia, Robert
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Rose	Golden (ME)
Burchett	Hill	Rosendale	Goldman (NY)
Burgess	Houchin	Rouzer	Gomez
Burlison	Hudson	Roy	Gonzales, Tony
Cammack	Huizenga	Rutherford	Gonzalez,
Carl	Hunt	Santos	Vicente
Carter (GA)	Issa	Scalise	González-Colón
Ciscomani	Jackson (TX)	James	Gottheimer
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Schweikert	Granger
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Self	Green, Al (TX)
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Smith (NE)	Grijalva
Collins	Jordan	Spartz	Graves (MO)
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Stauber	Greenaway
Crane	Kelly (MS)	Steel	Harder (CA)
Crawford	Kiggans (VA)	Stefanik	Hayes
Davidson	LaMalfa	Steil	Higgins (NY)
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Steube	Himes
DesJarlais	Latta	Tenney	Hinson
Donalds	LaTurner	Tiffany	Horsford
Duncan	Lesko	Timmons	Hoyer
Dunn (FL)	Loudermilk	Van Drew	Huffman
Emmer	Luna	Van Duyne	Ivey
Estes	Luttrell	Walberg	Jackson (IL)
Ezell	Mace	Williams (TX)	Jackson (NC)
Fallon	Mann	Williams (SC)	Kaptur
Finstad	Massie	Wittman	Kean (NJ)
Fischbach	Mast	Yakym	Keating
Fitzgerald	McCaul	Zinke	Kelly (IL)
Fleischmann	McClain		Kelly (PA)
Foxx	McClintock		Khanna
Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)		Kildee
Fry	Miller (WV)		Kiley
Fulcher	Mills		Kilmer
Gaetz	Molinaro		LaLota
			Lamborn
			Landsman
			Larson (CT)
			Kuster
			Kustoff
			LaHood
			LaLota
			Lamborn
			Lawler
			Lawyers
			Lee (CA)
			Lee (FL)
			Lee (IL)
			Lee (PA)
			Lee (VA)
			Levin
			Lieu
			LoFgren
			Lucas
			Luetkemeyer
			McBath
			McClellan
			McCormick
			McGarvey
			McGovern
			McHenry
			Meeks
			Menendez
			Meng
			Meuser
			Mifune
			Miller (OH)
			Moore (UT)
			Moore (WI)
			Moskowitz
			Stanton
			Stevens
			Strickland
			Takano
			Thanedar
			Thompson (CA)
			Thompson (MS)
			Thompson (PA)
			Titus
			Tlaib
			Tokuda
			Tonko
			Torres (CA)
			Torres (NY)
			Trahan
			Trone
			Pallone
			Panetta
			Pappas
			Pascarella
			Payne
			Pelosi
			Peltola
			Vargas
			Perez
			Vasquez
			Peters
			Veasey
			Velázquez
			Wagner
			Wasserman
			Schultz
			Waterson
			Watson Coleman
			Watson
			Wenstrup
			Wild
			Williams (GA)
			Williams (FL)
			Womack

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Connolly

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (NC)	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Bucshon	Larsen (WA)	Pressley
Crenshaw	McCarthy	Radwagen
Curtis	Miller-Meeks	Scholten
Gimenez	Morelle	Wexton
Houlahan	Norcross	
Hoyle (OR)	Phillips	

□ 2127

Mr. McCORMICK and Ms. LETLOW changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BURLISON, KELLY of Mississippi, and JAMES changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MRS. HARSHBARGER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YAKYM). The unfinished business is the demand for a