

# CONGRATULATING FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF COOKEVILLE, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate First Baptist Church of Cookeville on 150 years of spreading the Gospel throughout middle Tennessee.

I was raised at First Baptist Church and came to know my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, was baptized, and was a member for many years of First Baptist. My wife, Chelsea, and I were married in this church. Needless to say, I have received many blessings from this congregation.

The church was organized in 1873 with a congregation of 34 members. They agreed on a church covenant, which reads, in part: The purpose of this body is to advance the church in knowledge, holiness, and comfort, promoting prosperity and spirituality.

They continue to fulfill that commitment 150 years later.

The folks at Cookeville First Baptist embody what it means to have a servant's heart, whether it be through their many Bible study groups or missions, like Operation Christmas Child or their Family Life Center.

Today, the church enjoys a membership of more than 1,300 members. That is the result of 150 years of persistence and faith.

Madam Speaker, I pray they will continue to be a blessing to our community for the next 150 years.

# REMEMBERING THE 12 LIVES LOST AT BORDERLINE BAR AND GRILL 5 YEARS AGO

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I come before this body to remember the 12 innocent lives lost 5 years ago today at Borderline Bar and Grill in Thousand Oaks, California.

Our community was forever changed by this tragedy inflicted by the plague of gun violence that continues to permeate every corner of our country.

While House Republicans wasted precious time fighting with each other over electing a new Speaker for 21 days and 21 hours, there were 33 more mass shootings, 1,030 people died from gun violence, and another 2,072 people were injured.

Within hours of Speaker JOHNSON being elected, there was a mass shooting in Maine that resulted in the tragic loss of 18 lives and left 13 others injured.

Madam Speaker, the American people are no longer satisfied with empty offers of thoughts and prayers in times of such tragedies. They want action, not meaningless words.

In memory of the Borderline 12, I call on Speaker JOHNSON and my Republican colleagues to bring commonsense, lifesaving gun safety legislation, including a ban on assault weapons, to the floor now.

# CELEBRATING HMONG NEW YEAR

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, we are beginning November here. What does November mean? It varies from city to city, but it means the Hmong New Year.

Madam Speaker, I call to my colleagues' attention that some time during November or December, if you have a Hmong population close by, they will be celebrating their new year. I encourage everyone to show up and learn more about Hmong culture, their beautiful dress, great clothes, and great music.

Our country always has a debt to pay to the Hmong, who fought during the Vietnam war against totalitarian atheism, the most evil form of government we have ever known. Afterward, they came to our country.

Wisconsin has the third most Hmong in the country, and I have gotten to know many. I have yet to run into a Hmong family—I am sure they must exist—that was not doing very well. Everyone was getting married, having children, living the American Dream.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate my Hmong friends. I look forward to celebrating separate the new year in Oshkosh and Sheboygan. I hope that anyone listening out there finds their local Hmong New Year celebration.

# CONGRATULATING TOWN OF BETHEL, NORTH CAROLINA, UPON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the town of Bethel in Pitt County, North Carolina, on its remarkable 150th anniversary.

This past weekend, Mayor Carl and Mrs. Wilson, board members and staff, former Mayor and State Representative Gloristine Brown, Pitt County Board of Commissioners Chair Mary Perkins-Williams, Sheriff Paula Dance, town residents, and others far and near joined to commemorate the significant milestone.

Bethel is not just a town. It is a place of cherished experiences, stories, and enriched traditions that have enhanced countless lives. Indeed, Bethel offers old-time charm and exceptional family-friendly amenities.

Madam Speaker, I wish the town residents many more years filled with joy, unity, and prosperity.

□ 1230

# NAHASDA REAUTHORIZATION

(Mrs. PELTOLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. PELTOLA. Madam Speaker, I have heard stories from people across Alaska, some of the most rural and distant parts of our country, of about 20 people sharing a house with only three bedrooms and one bathroom. They sleep in shifts because they don't have enough space.

Without enough places to live, people are being forced out of their communities, the communities they love and the Native cultures they were raised in.

The Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, or NAHASDA, is called the backbone of Indian housing for the essential support block grants and financing it guarantees in order to develop critical affordable housing and community facilities. However, 15 years of inflation since the last reauthorization has decimated housing production.

I am asking Congress to reauthorize and properly fund NAHASDA. We cannot force Alaska Natives to make a choice between the communities of their place-based cultures or a roof over their head.

# PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4664, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 847 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 847

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to H.R. 4664, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in

section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules 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 this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. 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 of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered 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 this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 4664 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.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 4664 for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 847, providing for the House's continued consideration of appropriations bills for fiscal year 2024.

The rule provides for H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2024, to be considered under a structured rule with 104 amendments made in order.

It provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees and provides for one motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and support the underlying pieces of legislation.

H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2024, was subject to a robust committee process, one that saw both Republicans and Democrats offer amendments during the markup.

This is a work product the whole House can be proud of. Chairman WOMACK and his team, working together with Ranking Member HOYER and his team, have produced a comprehensive and timely bill. While I am sure the two sides have differences of opinion on the final product, I am also sure I am joined by all my colleagues in thanking them for their hard work.

There are many aspects of this appropriations bill that I want to highlight. First and foremost is the commitment to rooting out wasteful spending.

The bill limits funds for 31 unauthorized accounts for a savings to the American taxpayer of approximately \$64 million. It ensures that the Small Business Administration focuses on its core mission—helping small businesses—and not undertaking unnecessary climate activism outside of its primary responsibilities.

The bill also claws back wasteful spending from previous fiscal years, including money used to hire an army of IRS workers. The American people have been very clear. They don't want tens of thousands of additional IRS agents.

I also commend this bill as a product of strong cooperation between the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing Financial Services Committee, on which I am proud to sit. The bill furthers a lot of the efforts we have been working on in that committee.

It would prevent the SEC under Chair Gensler from finalizing rules that vastly overstep the Commission's jurisdiction, including ones that push ESG and Green New Deal agenda items over the interests of everyday investors.

The bill prevents the Federal Housing Finance Agency from forcing responsible borrowers to subsidize individuals with bad credit.

This bill also eliminates funding for the Federal Insurance Office and stops the Federal Government from taking over the insurance industry, an industry that is already successfully regulated at the State level.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the waste and abuse that this bill prudently targets, starting with penalizing the administration for not submitting its budget request on time. If the Presi-

dent can't complete this task, then there must be consequences. This is a basic principle in business and in our households, one our government would be prudent to similarly adopt.

Additionally, this legislation prohibits funds for Federal agencies until telework policies are reinstated to prepandemic standards. The pandemic is over, and it is long past time that the Federal Government returned to work. Our constituents deserve fully staffed and responsive agencies, and I commend Chairman WOMACK for his commitment to this principle.

Finally, we are here today and over the course of this week to consider more appropriations bills like the one provided for in this rule because we must rein in Federal spending.

To be more exact, this bill comes in at approximately 20 percent below the President's request, without sacrificing essential government functions. If enacted, it represents a modest 7 percent cut below last year's fiscal level.

The most important number we should all keep in mind is \$33 trillion, that is \$33 trillion in debt. We can no longer afford to kick the can down the metaphorical road. Madam Speaker, there is no road left.

We need to pass this rule and the FSGG appropriations bill so we can continue to deliver on the fiscal sanity that puts us back on the right path.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana, Mrs. HOUCHIN, for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, after wasting weeks as Republicans tried to get their house in order, we have just 10 days left to fund the government or we shut down.

My colleagues across the aisle might say that the House has already passed 7 of 12 funding bills, but they know those bills are so extreme that they won't get the necessary Democratic or Republican votes in the Senate and don't have any chance of becoming law.

We are reviewing another extreme bill today, H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2024.

Let's start with the numbers. The bill is 58 percent below last year's level. If any of you had a business or just balanced your housing budget, what would happen if you cut almost 60 percent from what you had to spend from one year to the next? Your business or your household would fail.

If a budget reflects your values, this extreme Republican bill values the wealthy, the well-connected, the fraudsters, and the scammers.

A family putting their baby to bed tonight knows cribs are safe. The babies aren't being strangled because of the work of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, which recently turned 50.

What are Republicans doing in this bill to this well-honored and respected

Commission? They are cutting their funding by 10 percent, so big corporations can put profit over safety. Right now a small business entrepreneur in a rural community or an affordable housing developer in an urban neighborhood that the big banks ignore can secure financing from a community development financial institution.

What is H.R. 4664 doing about those great affordable housing opportunities? They are cutting the CDFI funding by \$45 million. They are cutting the Small Business Administration's entrepreneurship program by \$72 million. They are destroying opportunities that could be created in small places that big banks just don't care about.

We want to grow the middle class and lower costs for Americans, but this bill would do the opposite by slashing the budgets of the agencies that protect consumers.

American consumers can sometimes feel helpless against the robocalls, the credit card and bank fees, and the financial scammers. Well, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau helped those consumers get \$19 billion back when they went after those scammers, when they went after those excessive fees. However, this bill would weaken this agency, an agency that was born out of the 2008 financial crisis and the Great Recession, a crisis that I will remind everybody occurred on Republicans' watch and brought great suffering to families and businesses.

This bill also undermines oversight of Wall Street when it cuts the SEC by \$149 million. Remember the SEC? It also came into existence, but this time during the Great Depression. In each financial crisis we have mentioned, Democratic Congresses and Presidents stood with small businesses and working families against greed. Yes, the greed of Wall Street and the greed of payday lenders.

This bill tells us that extreme Republicans are okay with dangerous or defective products making their way into homes. Indeed, last night, one Republican Member said we should just get rid of the Consumer Product Safety Commission or just let them make recommendations, maybe Congress will act. It is ridiculous to get rid of this important consumer product safety agency.

Finally, this bill rescinds \$10.2 billion from funding we gave to the IRS last year. Then it cuts more funds for the IRS to modernize or protect itself from cybersecurity threats. Why would you want to make the IRS vulnerable to cybersecurity threats?

To add insult, the bill would keep the IRS from developing a program so Americans can file their taxes for free. Really? You want to make sure for-profit companies can charge taxpayers to file their taxes? How cynical is that?

□ 1245

At a time when Americans are worried about fentanyl killing their loved ones, this bill cuts funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

At a time when Americans are worried about terrorism, this bill cuts funding for the National Security Council and Homeland Security Advisory Council.

While this bill cuts funding for CDFI, Democrats are fighting to grow the middle class by making housing more affordable.

While Republicans cut funding to the SBA, we are putting people over politics by supporting small businesses.

Democrats, as we have been saying for the last 3 years, put people over politics.

Unfortunately, this weekend the Republican Speaker of the House stated he would not put people over politics. Well, today's appropriations bill actually proves that.

I will end where I started. There are just 11 days to fund the government. We need spending bills that are bipartisan, that address the real needs of American taxpayers instead of just protecting the wealthy and well off.

House Democrats want to work in a bipartisan manner to get things done for the American people, but we will not stand for the extreme culture wars, the attacks on reproductive healthcare, and the draconian cuts House Republicans keep putting up for a vote in these appropriations bills.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the sky is not falling. I would remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the spending levels in this bill are the same as they were just 10 months ago. The sky was not falling then, and the sky is not falling now.

We are talking about cuts to some agencies, agencies that are intent on overregulating our small and midsize banks out of business.

If our colleagues on the left would have their way, we would have three major national banks and no access to community lending.

I certainly think my constituents would rather have access to their community banks than worry about how much funding level we are giving those agencies.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank my great friend and colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from Indiana, for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, since January 2021, the Biden administration has been laser focused on making the fantasy of the Green New Deal a reality for Americans.

Earlier this year, the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed the so-called Climate Disclosure Project, which would require an entirely new level of burdensome, costly emissions reporting.

Now, who will this rule impact the most? Not big business, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like people to believe. Instead, all of these new compliance costs, as with almost every new rule and regulation imposed by this Biden administration, will be felt mostly and most painfully by small business owners, farmers, and independent manufacturers.

Let me be clear: This misguided rule will hurt hardworking Americans and hinder economic growth at a time where we should be focused on creating jobs and lowering inflation.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line is this: Main Street can't afford the Biden economy. The American people can't afford it.

It hasn't stopped this administration from plowing ahead with even more bans and phaseouts and regulations on everything from internal combustion engines to gas stoves.

My district sees some of the coldest and harshest winters in the country in a State that, thanks to Governor Kathy Hochul, is already one step ahead of the Biden administration in eliminating natural gas as an affordable and reliable source of clean energy.

We can't afford to allow this administration to take what climate extremists in States like New York and California are doing and turn it into a nationwide effort.

At a time when this world is on fire and the rising cost of living is unsustainable, the last thing President Biden should be worried about is banning gas stoves, nickel-and-diming small businesses for emissions, and mobilizing a new IRS and a whole lot more agents to target hardworking families and small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 4664 and protect American families, farmers, and small businesses from this administration's reckless agenda.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Americans know that the climate catastrophe is wreaking havoc on our economy.

I come from a State where we lost billions due to wildfires that were caused by many factors, but this repeats itself over and over again.

Across America, there is no place that is safe from the climate catastrophe: the flooding, the hurricanes, the fires, the drought, and those cost money.

They cost our farmers money. They cost our ranchers money, our cities, our towns, our governments, and so yes, we must address that.

In fact, this administration was elected precisely because he said he would address that. We need to emphasize that. To pretend that there isn't an economic cost is to put your head in the sand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my wonderful colleague representing the District

of Columbia, which is a Democratically elected city, and we should respect it as such.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose this rule and the fiscal year 2024 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill.

The bill blocks, repeals, or amends ten laws and policies adopted by the District of Columbia's locally elected officials.

The rule also makes in order three amendments that would block D.C. from spending its local funds, which consist of local taxes and fees, to carry out local D.C. laws and policies.

While Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, it does not have a constitutional duty to do so. Instead, legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice.

The Supreme Court has held that Congress may delegate "fully legislative power" to D.C. on local D.C. matters.

D.C.'s local legislature, the D.C. Council, has 13 members. All members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like the laws the Council adopts, they can vote those members out of office. That is called democracy.

Congress has 435 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of the States. None are elected by or accountable to D.C. residents.

If D.C. residents do not like the laws Congress adopts, they cannot vote the Members out of office. This is the antithesis of democracy.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet, D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on national or local matters, and pay full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 19 States.

D.C. residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves. If House Republicans cared about Democratic principles affecting 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 the floor.

Congress has the constitutional authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. It simply lacks the will.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to touch on a few things mentioned by my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

We talk about no economic cost to what they are doing in this bill in terms of climate, but we saw during the collapse of Silicon Valley Bank and Signature Bank that our regulators Federally were spending more time focused on climate risk to our financial sector than to systemic risk.

This is an asleep-at-the-wheel approach of the Biden administration that we are trying to avoid in this piece of legislation.

My colleagues also discussed the District of Columbia. Well, the District of Columbia is receiving Federal funds in this piece of legislation which does give us an opportunity to weigh in on what we think the policies and the policy riders that should follow within that should be attached to this piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), an esteemed Member who I look forward to hearing his viewpoints on the importance of addressing the urgent needs that Americans have told us about such as how do we lower costs, how do we make sure that we bring into line Americans' dreams with Americans' realities.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the lack of resources for safe and affordable housing in the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development funding bill.

Sadly, it does nothing to address the significant housing and community development needs of our constituents.

Across the country, Madam Speaker, more Americans than ever are cost burdened with the price of rent. Parents are worried about whether they can keep a roof over their families' head. Frankly, Madam Speaker, the rent is too damn high.

This bill rescinds \$560 million from accounts that would address the current harmful conditions of the housing that residents currently face.

The New York City Housing Authority has revealed that over the next 5 years, to address the current and future capital needs, the agency will need \$60 billion. These needs will only continue to compound.

Instead of helping make these investments, the bill funds the public housing fund at a \$150 million below last year's fiscal budget.

Americans deserve to live in safe, reliable, and dignified housing, Madam Speaker. The bill does nothing, absolutely nothing, to accomplish this, and I urge my colleagues to vote against its final passage.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, again, this bill funds at a level that we were just at 10 months ago. The sky

was not falling then. The sky is not falling now, despite protestations of my friends from the other side of the aisle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 847 and to reiterate our commitment to equal justice under the law.

As Members of this distinguished body, we all take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Unfortunately, the Financial Services and General Government bill we will consider this week will undermine the constitutional rights of Americans.

In this legislation, Federal public defenders face a steep cut—an underfunding of nearly \$100 million. This is unacceptable and will disrupt equal access to justice.

Nearly 90 percent of defendants in Federal criminal cases cannot afford an attorney, which is their constitutional right to have. If there are not enough Federal defenders, cases could be delayed, and the cost will be more in the long run.

□ 1300

Defendants will be referred to private panel attorneys, who typically have less experience and cost more. That makes no sense.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. This is an issue of constitutional rights, and it is smart fiscal policy.

For several years, I have led bipartisan efforts to adequately fund Federal public defenders, and this year, I have led several bipartisan calls to fully fund our Federal defenders.

We must defeat this rule and return the bill to committee so we can follow through on our constitutional responsibility to adequately fund Federal public defenders. It is their right to have counsel. If it is not afforded, they will be referred to panel attorneys, who cost more. That makes no sense, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the Defender Services Advisory Group, emphasizing that failing to adequately fund Federal public defense will inflict a cascade of dangerous and damaging consequences on their program, on clients, and on our criminal justice system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PUBLIC & COMMUNITY DEFENDERS, DEFENDER SERVICES ADVISORY GROUP,

Topeka, KS, November 1, 2023.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,  
*Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations.*  
Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,  
*Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations,  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and  
General Government.*  
Hon. KAY GRANGER,  
*Chair, House Committee on Appropriations.*  
Hon. STEVE WOMACK,  
*Chair, House Committee on Appropriations,  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and  
General Government.*  
Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
*Vice Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations.*  
Hon. BILL HAGERTY,  
*Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Appropriations,  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government.*  
Hon. ROSA DELAURO,  
*Ranking Member,  
House Committee on Appropriations.*  
Hon. STENY HOYER,  
*Ranking Member, House Committee on Appropriations,  
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government.*

DEAR CHAIR MURRAY, VICE CHAIR COLLINS, SENATOR VAN HOLLEN, SENATOR HAGERTY, CHAIR GRANGER, RANKING MEMBER DELAURO, REPRESENTATIVE WOMACK, AND REPRESENTATIVE HOYER: We write on behalf of the Federal Public and Community Defenders with an update on the federal defender appropriation crisis. We appreciate the opportunity to provide more information on this evolving topic.

Earlier this month, upon the close of FY 2023, the Judiciary directed us to prepare a fall re-estimate of our budgetary needs for FY 2024. The fall re-estimate reflects two realities: 1) the Judiciary's recognition that we need more on-board staff to adequately represent our clients; and 2) the fact that—due in substantial part to the emergency cost-saving measures we initiated earlier this summer—the defender program has a greater carryforward into FY 2024 than we first projected.

The defender-initiated cost-saving measures have narrowed the gap between the current congressional marks and the minimum appropriation required to meet our obligations. Before, we needed \$136.3 million above the Senate mark and about \$108 million above the House mark simply to maintain current services. Today—through defender discipline and diligence over the last fiscal quarter—we need at least \$109 million above the Senate mark or \$80.6 million above the House mark. We hope these lower, re-estimated numbers will make it easier for Congress to increase our appropriation by the amount we need to fulfill our constitutional mandate.

The austerity measures our program implemented over the past fiscal quarter have reduced the total appropriation we need to fulfill our mission in FY 2024. But we must emphasize that our efforts to conserve resources have not been without consequence to our program and our clients. Defender offices around the country have been short-staffed, which strains capacity and morale. We have seen an uptick in defender attrition, an inability to draw and retain experienced defenders, and a reduced availability of defender offices to take on critical assignments both within their districts and in connection with high-profile prosecutorial initiatives (such as McGirt cases). We are already bearing the burden of the appropriation shortfall.

We must also emphasize that our fiscal situation will dramatically change if we are subject to a prolonged continuing resolution

in FY 2024 that caps us at our FY 2023 appropriation minus one percent. In that scenario, our FY 2024 appropriation amount would be \$1.368 billion. At that level, we would need an additional \$136.9 million to meet our FY 2024 financial requirements as outlined in our fall re-estimate.

As we have explained elsewhere, failing to adequately fund federal public defense will inflict a cascade of damaging consequences on our program, on our clients, and on the judicial system. These consequences will cost more in the long run than they will save now. We remain in a dire situation where—barring an increase of at least \$109 million to the current Senate mark for our program (and \$80.6 million to the current House mark)—we will face catastrophic layoffs, unpaid furloughs, or panel deferments that will seriously damage the federal criminal system and our clients.

We are grateful that Congress still has an opportunity to appropriate or supplement the sum necessary to avert these grave consequences. And we deeply appreciate your ongoing support for the federal defender program. Please be in touch if you need any further information from us or if you have questions about our situation.

Sincerely,

MELODY BRANNON,  
*Federal Public Defender for the District of Kansas, Co-Chair, Defender Services Advisory Group.*

CRAIG ALBEE,  
*Executive Director, Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin, CDO-Chair, Defender Services Advisory Group.*

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with the Nation \$33 trillion in debt, a number higher than the U.S. GDP, Congress has the responsibility to reduce Federal spending when possible.

According to the CBO, the United States ran a \$1.7 trillion deficit in 2023, driven by \$6.1 trillion in spending and \$4.4 trillion in revenues following a \$1.4 trillion deficit in fiscal year 2022.

This type of spending is completely unacceptable, and every Member of Congress knows it.

With regard to funding for public defenders, \$1.14 billion is afforded in this bill for public defender services. This provides \$8.7 billion for the judiciary, of which \$110.4 million is above the fiscal year 2023 enacted level.

There is no amount of spending cuts that our friends on the left will support. We have to get our fiscal house in order. This is a responsible step forward while still providing for the needs of the American people.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we hear time and again that these draconian spending cuts are necessary because of the deficit, but let's take a step back and think about how we got here in the first place and what we really can do about it.

We need to remember that 36 percent of the debt is due to Republican tax

cuts, the Iraq war, the Republican war. This does not include the \$12.5 billion that Republicans are adding to the deficit from their cuts to the IRS last week.

Clearly, Republicans like to talk about this, but they don't fix the problem. Indeed, they are the problem. Their tax cuts are the problem.

While the House GOP continues to blame critical social, economic development, and law enforcement programs for the Nation's debt, they hide the fact that if it weren't for those tax cuts enacted under President Bush and President Trump, our debt wouldn't be an issue. Indeed, the report shows that revenues would have kept up with spending if we wouldn't have had these tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let's remind people where those tax cuts went. Who benefited? The wealthy and the corporations that to this day still do not pay their fair share in taxes.

If you want to address the issue of the deficit, let's address the issue of the tax cuts, which you can see on this chart are primarily due to the Trump and the Bush tax cuts, which isn't included on here, or the Reagan tax cuts, which is when we started this downward spiral.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would note for my friends on the other side of the aisle that 40 percent of the debt was incurred under NANCY PELOSI. Both parties are responsible, but it is only House Republicans that seem to be focused on cutting Federal spending. It just simply cannot continue.

It is why House Republicans have put forward and support a bipartisan debt commission. We are talking about discretionary spending in these bills, not mandatory spending. The lion's share of our debt is due to our mandatory spending. We must address that.

Again, I commend Chairman WOMACK on this piece of legislation for trying to cut unnecessary programs, stop funding for unauthorized programs, cut spending, and get us back on a better path of fiscal sanity.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people's House's duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and to fight against any cuts to these vital programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA), to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Social Security and Medicare are core promises that we make as a country to every American. More than 66 million seniors, people with disabilities, and children rely on Social Security, but make no mistake, my colleagues in the majority are committed to cutting these programs down to the bone.

In 2020, even our new Speaker wrote a budget proposal that called for raising Medicare and Social Security eligibility ages. It called for \$2 trillion in cuts to Medicare and \$750 billion in cuts to Social Security. It would be devastating to millions of people, including 8 million veterans who rely on Social Security and Medicare every single day and middle-class people across the country who would see their benefits cut. Cost of living increases that seniors rely on would also be slashed.

The new Speaker is calling for a commission, which would be empowered to slash Social Security and fast-track his extreme proposals through Congress.

Speaker JOHNSON is so out of touch that he also claimed *Roe v. Wade* and reproductive rights now require us to make more cuts to Medicare and Social Security. This is not the agenda the American people accept or support.

Congress should come together to pass H. Res. 178 and commit to protecting Social Security and Medicare for all Americans. No cuts and no stripping benefits away from the people who work for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up this important legislation.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing to say that Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare, to quote my colleague, "cutting these programs down to the bone," doesn't make it so.

Republicans are committed to reducing spending. We are committed to trying to find a way to get our fiscal house in order and to get us out of the calamity that we are currently in with our financial situation.

The debt commission won't make cuts. It might make recommendations on how we can restore the Nation's fiscal health, which is a matter of national security. It doesn't matter if we don't make cuts or if we make cuts if Social Security becomes insolvent. We cannot let that happen, not on our watch.

Republicans are taking the initiative and taking the lead on trying to solve the problem.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I will touch on the idea that the Trump tax cuts are suddenly the Pelosi tax cuts. That is ridiculous. We know the Trump tax cuts. They claimed them. They want to extend them. In fact, they have already been working on a bill in the Ways and Means Committee that would increase tax cuts for the wealthy, but let's put that aside.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about something else that is in this bill that is very problematic. We know that we are in a period when elections are so key, and preserving the integrity of our elections and making sure that those who work on the democratic process, the day-to-day process of making sure that our elections work, have all the help that they can get.

Right now, State and local election administrators are working hard to make sure that is possible, but they are afraid.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the 2023 Brennan Center poll analysis about the high turnover of election officials amid safety threats and political interference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

[From the Brennan Center for Justice, Apr. 25, 2023]

#### POLL OF ELECTION OFFICIALS SHOWS HIGH TURNOVER AMID SAFETY THREATS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Forty-five percent of local election officials said they fear for the safety of their colleagues.

A new Brennan Center survey of local election officials from around the country shows that many election officials have left the field, and more plan to go. In 2020, confronted with the Covid-19 pandemic, election officials ran what the key government agencies at the time called the "most secure election in American history" with the highest voter turnout in over 100 years. But since then, the election officials have found themselves targeted by a campaign to lie about election results and undermine faith in American democracy.

Scapegoated for election outcomes that some politicians and voters did not like, many election officials have faced death threats, online harassment, and abuse. Political leaders interfered in their work by censoring or replacing some officials who told the truth about election security, and in some states they enacted new laws exposing officials to criminal penalties for minor infractions or for taking proactive steps to help their voters.

The result is hollowing out the ranks of experienced election administration professionals, with potentially more to come in the next year. The survey found that 12 percent of local election officials began their service after the 2020 election cycle. Another 11 percent of current officials say they are very or somewhat likely to leave before November 2024. If these officials follow through and exit their positions, we will have lost approximately 1.5 election officials per day between the November 2020 and 2024 elections.

The loss of institutional knowledge that accompanies such high turnover can mean

that election officials are less aware of resources available to assist them in securing and running their elections. Large numbers of resignations can also result in more administrative mistakes, which can in turn fuel conspiracy theories and threats, continuing the cycle that has led to resignations in the first place.

The findings of our survey provide some explanation as to why election officials continue to leave office at high rates, as well as some clues as to what can be done to staunch the bleeding and offer support where it is needed most, particularly to the field's newest members.

#### DANGERS ON THE JOB

Threats, abuse, and harassment continue to be a significant concern in the field. Cathy Darling Allen, the clerk and registrar of voters of Shasta County, California, has described fearing for the safety of her staff after discovering a surveillance camera planted at the back entrance of her office used by poll workers during the 2022 primary. At least one other official discovered a wireless video camera aimed at his front door. In Gillespie County, Texas, election staff endured several kinds of harassment, including volunteer poll watchers calling the police and filming staff in a dark parking lot, attempting to forcibly enter a secure ballot vault, and stalking and threatening some staffers. In August 2022, the entire staff resigned, with at least one person citing threats in her resignation letter.

This issue is not limited to a small number of places: our survey shows that nearly one in three election officials have been harassed, abused, or threatened because of their job. Alarming, more than one in five are concerned about being physically assaulted on the job in future elections. Election officials worry about their colleagues, with 45 percent of respondents expressing concern for the safety of other election officials and workers in future elections. Not surprisingly then, more than half of respondents expressed concern that the attacks will make it more difficult to retain or recruit election workers in future elections.

#### LACK OF FUNDING HURTS ELECTION SECURITY

At the same time, 74% of local election officials say they need their annual budget to grow to address security and election administration needs over the next five years. Election systems are critical infrastructure vital to our democracy and national security, and Congress's unwillingness to provide adequate funding is a significant failure. While the Department of Homeland Security's announcement requiring more federal grant money be dedicated to election security was a step in the right direction, our survey shows there is more work to do.

Election officials say increased funding would allow them to invest in more poll workers and improved voting equipment, as well as strengthen cybersecurity and the physical security of election offices. Many election officials have sought to secure their offices following threats. An election official in Jackson County, Oregon asked the state for about \$80,000 to install bullet-resistant glass and transaction windows at certain office counters after the parking lot was painted with threatening language. The Brennan Center has estimated that implementing basic physical security measures to protect election workers would cost about \$300 million over the next five years.

Our survey shows that election officials are unable to adopt basic physical and cybersecurity measures because they do not have the funds to do so. Of the 49 election officials we interviewed who availed themselves of free cyber hygiene scans provided by DHS's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security



Agency and the 54 who received their free physical security assessments, the vast majority implemented at least some of the recommended improvements. But in each category, only 10 adopted all recommendations. Of those who did not adopt more recommendations, lack of funds was the top reason why not.

#### POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Election officials continue to express concern about political interference in alarmingly high numbers. In the aftermath of the 2020 election, many election officials faced pressure from political leaders to certify certain election outcomes. President Trump notoriously called Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to ask him to “find 11,780 votes.” In 2021, Arizona legislators transferred powers from the state’s Democratic secretary of state over to the attorney general, apparently to prevent the settlement of lawsuits aiming to improve voter access. In Wisconsin and Arizona, sham partisan reviews of the 2020 election were used to misrepresent the work of election officials and cast doubt on legitimate results.

Many local election officials see this threat of political interference as ongoing, with 56 percent reporting that they are either somewhat or very worried about political leaders engaging in efforts to interfere with how their fellow election officials do their jobs. And more than one in nine say they are concerned about facing pressure to certify election results in favor of a specific candidate or party in future elections.

#### FEDERAL SUPPORT

Most election officials feel that the federal government could be doing more to help, with only 27 percent saying that the federal government is doing a “good job” supporting them in their roles. Election officials have reason to complain. In addition to the \$300 million mentioned above for protecting election workers from new threats and violence, the Brennan Center has also estimated the cost of protecting against insider threats as a result of growing belief in conspiracy theories around elections could similarly exceed \$300 million. Further, we estimated in 2022 that the cost to replace polling place voting machines that are aging out is nearly \$600 million over the following 5 years. Despite these massive numbers, Congress provided just \$75 million in new money for elections last year.

While this failure is frustrating, it’s also worth noting many election officials aren’t aware of the full range of federal services available to them, such as federal grant programs and communications toolkits. This lack of awareness is also an opportunity for the federal government. As soon as possible, federal agencies that provide resources to election officials should develop a comprehensive and coordinated communications plan to establish regular contact with election officials through the 2024 election, promote federal funding opportunities and resources, and provide election officials with a venue to highlight questions and concerns.

By and large, the 2022 election was a success for election administration. There was limited violence, courts pushed back on efforts to refuse to certify elections, and election deniers lost key governor and secretary of state contests.

With the 2024 presidential election approaching, now is the time to ask what we can do to further strengthen election administration. It’s clear that many election officials still feel they face a hostile environment, with more than 1 in 10 saying they very or somewhat likely to exit their office in the relatively short time before November 2024. We should work to strengthen cyber and physical protections for election offices, in-

crease funding, and elevate available resources for election officials.

**Note on Methodology:** Our calculation for the rate of turnover among election officials was made as follows: there are approximately 10,000 local election officials in the United States. In our survey, 12 percent of election officials stated they had replaced their predecessors after November 2020, amounting to 1,200 officials. About 900 days passed between the November 2020 election and when the poll was conducted: 1,200 officials divided by 900 days equals roughly 1.34. 11 percent of officials are unlikely to continue serving through November 2024, amounting to 1,100 officials. 1,100 officials divided by 560 days until the November 2024 election equals roughly 1.96.

**Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.** Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4664 would make it harder for those hardworking election officials to do their jobs.

This bill cuts funding for the Election Assistance Commission by \$8 million. That funding helps State and local officials administer fair, free, and secure elections. H.R. 4664 would also eliminate funding for election security grants.

In New Mexico, the secretary of State has used that money for security trainings and to enhance voter registration.

Don’t we all want more people to vote? I know Democrats do.

Indiana, as an example, has used funds for election security and to upgrade voting equipment. This bill says to those election administrators: Good luck. We are not helping you anymore with these kinds of Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, that is not all. This bill includes multiple riders that would allow private companies, nonprofits, and government contractors to keep their political spending secret. This type of secrecy leads the American public to lose faith in our representative government. Our constituents deserve transparency and to know that we work for them and not some special interest group.

Let’s put this bill aside and instead take up one that our democracy deserves. We must always be working to that more perfect Union that our Constitution calls out, but it requires work and funding our elections at adequate levels.

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

**Mrs. HOUCHIN.** Mr. Speaker, I note again that this bill is funded at levels that we were just under 10 months ago. If we were operating just fine 10 months ago under the grants that my colleague mentioned, then we will be operating just fine following the passage of this bill.

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

**Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.** Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, think about this rule. It sets out many amendments, and that is what we have been seeing when we have been coming to the floor. We come down and spend 10 minutes debating amendments that would reduce

somebody’s salary to \$1, but then it loses overwhelmingly. Over and over, we keep coming to the floor and debating these amendments that are non-starters from the beginning, but we are taking up precious floor time to do that.

Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment that isn’t in this rule that passed out of committee on a 30-30 vote. It was highly bipartisan and didn’t make it into the underlying bill. We asked last night if we couldn’t bring an amendment like this that clearly has bipartisan support to the floor so that House Members would be able to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, that amendment was the bipartisan Aguilar-Ciscomani amendment, which would have allowed DACA recipients to work for the Federal Government.

Remember, Dreamers can lawfully work for State, local, and Tribal governments and in the private sector. Americans overwhelmingly support Dreamers who were brought to this country at a young age and grew up here. Up to 73 percent of voters in battleground States support Dreamers and their ability to work.

This is the kind of amendment that this rule should have made in order. I am disappointed that it didn’t.

Mr. Speaker, as noted, after waiting weeks for the Republicans to stop their infighting, we have just 10 days to fund the government. However, my colleagues across the aisle have brought forward a bill that slashes crucial funding for agencies that protect hardworking Americans. Remember, this bill is 58 percent below what was appropriated last year.

What does it do? It makes it easier for scammers, fraudsters, and cheaters to exploit vulnerable citizens, including our seniors and children, and makes it easier for them to get away with it.

The proposed cuts to agencies like the IRS, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission would expose families to greater risk, all while protecting the interests of the wealthy and the well connected.

As if that wasn’t enough, this bill reduces support for election officials by eliminating funding for election security grants.

In June, Congressional Republicans and Democrats and President Biden made a deal to keep the lights on, and we passed the Fiscal Responsibility Act into law. Mr. Speaker, 149 Republicans voted for that law.

Americans expect us to live up to our word. Americans expect us to live up to our promise. Americans expect us to live up to a law that came out of significant and intense negotiation as to what the funding level for government would be.

Unfortunately, Republicans broke that promise. They didn’t even wait a week before they broke that promise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and this

rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

We face another week of big legislation under consideration for a vote on the House floor to better the lives of everyday Americans. H.R. 4664, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2024, as well as the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, which was provided for under a separate rule, are important steps in delivering on our promises for a Nation that is both responsive and responsible to the American people and one that delivers a government that is accountable.

It is Republicans that are keeping our Commitment to America. With the passage of these two bills, we are closer to finalizing the appropriations process. We can continue to lead while also reining in out-of-control government spending.

As I said in my opening remarks, we need to pass this rule and the FSGG appropriations bill so we can continue delivering fiscal sanity to put us back on a better path.

I look forward to moving these promises out of the House this week. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 847 OFFERED BY  
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives’ commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) at 1 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 847; and

Adoption of House Resolution 847, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4664, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 847) providing for 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 204, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—217

Aderholt  
Alford  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Barr  
Bean (FL)  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice  
Biggs  
Bilirakis

Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brecheen  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Burlison  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chavez-DeRemer

Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
De La Cruz  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duarte

Duncan  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Foxy  
Franklin, Scott  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)

Joyce (PA)  
Kean (NJ)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Langworthy  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luna  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McHenry  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moonenar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Oberholte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Palmer

Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Santos  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duyn  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

NAYS—204

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragan  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney

Craig  
Crockett  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Foushee  
Frankel, Lois  
Frost  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert  
Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes

Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Landsman  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez