

Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner

Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Petersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Santos
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tanney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)

Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke
NOT VOTING—6
Craig
DesJarlais
Gonzales, Tony
Houlahan
Jackson (TX)
Ross

□ 1637

Mrs. TORRES of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable travel delays, I was unable to be present for this afternoon’s votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 241, H. Res. 456, and “yea” on rollcall No. 242, H. Res. 382.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 25

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s request is accepted.

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 4 o’clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1915

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 7 o’clock and 15 minutes p.m.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2023

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 456, I call up the bill (H.R. 3746) to provide for a responsible increase to the debt ceiling, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 456, the amendment printed in House Report 118–81 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3746

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. References.
- DIVISION A—LIMIT FEDERAL SPENDING
- TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY
- Sec. 101. Discretionary spending limits.
- Sec. 102. Special adjustments for fiscal years 2024 and 2025.
- Sec. 103. Budgetary treatment of previously enacted emergency requirements.
- TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
- Sec. 111. Authority for Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Resolution in the House of Representatives.
- Sec. 112. Limitation on Advance Appropriations in the House of Representatives.
- Sec. 113. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
- TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE SENATE
- Sec. 121. Authority for fiscal year 2024 budget resolution in the Senate.
- Sec. 122. Authority for fiscal year 2025 budget resolution in the Senate.
- Sec. 123. Limitation on advance appropriations in the Senate.
- Sec. 124. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
- DIVISION B—SAVE TAXPAYER DOLLARS
- TITLE I—RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS
- Sec. 1. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 2. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 3. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 4. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 5. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 6. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 7. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 8. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 9. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 10. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 11. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 12. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 13. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 14. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 15. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 16. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 17. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 18. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 19. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 20. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 21. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 22. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 23. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 24. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 25. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 26. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 27. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 28. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 29. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 30. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 31. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 32. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 33. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 34. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 35. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 36. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 37. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 38. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 39. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 40. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 41. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 42. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 43. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 44. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 45. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 46. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 47. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 48. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 49. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 50. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 51. Rescission of unobligated funds.
- Sec. 52. Rescission of unobligated funds.

Sec. 53. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 54. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 55. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 56. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 57. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 58. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 59. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 60. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 61. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 62. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 63. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 64. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 65. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 66. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 67. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 68. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 69. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 70. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 71. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 72. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 73. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 74. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 75. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 76. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 77. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 78. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 79. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 80. Rescission of unobligated funds.
 Sec. 81. Rescission of unobligated funds.

TITLE II—FAMILY AND SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYER PROTECTION

Sec. 251. Rescission of certain balances made available to the Internal Revenue Service.

TITLE III—STATUTORY ADMINISTRATIVE PAY-AS-YOU-GO

Sec. 261. Short title.
 Sec. 262. Definitions.
 Sec. 263. Requirements for administrative actions that affect direct spending.
 Sec. 264. Issuance of administrative guidance.
 Sec. 265. Waiver.
 Sec. 266. Exemption.
 Sec. 267. Judicial review.
 Sec. 268. Sunset.
 Sec. 269. GAO report.
 Sec. 270. Congressional Review Act compliance assessment.

TITLE IV—TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS; RESUMPTION OF ACCRUAL OF INTEREST AND COLLECTIONS

Sec. 271. Termination of suspension of payments on Federal student loans; resumption of accrual of interest and collections.

DIVISION C—GROW THE ECONOMY

TITLE I—TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES

Sec. 301. Recalibration of the caseload reduction credit.
 Sec. 302. Pilot projects for promoting accountability by measuring work outcomes.
 Sec. 303. Elimination of small checks scheme.
 Sec. 304. Reporting of work outcomes.
 Sec. 305. Effective date.

TITLE II—SNAP EXEMPTIONS

Sec. 311. Modification of work requirement exemptions.
 Sec. 312. Modification of general exemptions.
 Sec. 313. Supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.
 Sec. 314. Waiver transparency.

TITLE III—PERMITTING REFORM

Sec. 321. Builder Act.
 Sec. 322. Interregional Transfer Capability Determination Study.

Sec. 323. Permitting streamlining for energy storage.

Sec. 324. Expediting completion of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

DIVISION D—INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

Sec. 401. Temporary extension of public debt limit.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to “this Act” contained in any division of this Act shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of that division.

DIVISION A—LIMIT FEDERAL SPENDING

TITLE I—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY

SEC. 101. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(B), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) for fiscal year 2024—

“(A) for the revised security category, \$886,349,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(B) for the revised nonsecurity category; \$703,651,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(10) for fiscal year 2025—

“(A) for the revised security category, \$895,212,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(B) for the revised nonsecurity category; \$710,688,000,000 in new budget authority.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDERMINATIONS.—Section 251(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended—

(A) in subclause (IX), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (X), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (X) the following:

“(XI) for fiscal year 2024, \$1,578,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(XII) for fiscal year 2025, \$1,630,000,000 in additional new budget authority.”

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—Section 251(b)(2)(C)(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) in subclause (IX), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (X), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (X) the following:

“(XI) for fiscal year 2024, \$604,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(XII) for fiscal year 2025, \$630,000,000 in additional new budget authority.”

(3) DISASTER FUNDING.—Section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “for fiscal years 2012 through 2021” and inserting “for fiscal years 2024 and 2025”; and

(B) by amending subclause (II) to read as follows:

“(II) notwithstanding clause (iv), five percent of the total appropriations provided in the previous 10 years, net of any rescissions of budget authority enacted in the same period, with respect to amounts provided for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and designated by the Congress in statute as an emergency; and”

(4) REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENTS.—Section 251(b)(2)(E)(i) of such Act is amended—

(A) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (IV), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following:

“(V) for fiscal year 2024, \$265,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2025, \$271,000,000 in additional new budget authority.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SEQUESTRATION REPORTS.—Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “2021” and inserting “2025”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)(A), by striking “2021” and inserting “2025”.

(d) APPROPRIATION FOR COST OF WAR TOXIC EXPOSURES FUND.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, there are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for investment in the delivery of veterans’ health care associated with exposure to environmental hazards, the expenses incident to the delivery of veterans’ health care and benefits associated with exposure to environmental hazards, and medical and other research relating to exposure to environmental hazards, as authorized by section 324 of title 38, United States Code—

(1) \$20,268,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2023, and shall remain available until September 30, 2028; and

(2) \$24,455,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2024, and shall remain available until September 30, 2029.

(e) APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NONRECURRING EXPENSES FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated to the Department of Commerce Nonrecurring Expenses Fund for fiscal year 2023, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$22,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(A) \$11,000,000,000 is to carry out programs related to Government efficiencies in fiscal year 2024; and

(B) \$11,000,000,000 is to carry out programs related to Government efficiencies in fiscal year 2025.

(2) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER.—Funds provided by paragraph (1) shall not be subject to any transfer authority provided by law.

(3) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Reporting requirements in section 111(a) of division B of Public Law 116–93 shall apply to funds provided by paragraph (1).

(4) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this subsection shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(5) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this subsection and each succeeding division shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(6) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this subsection shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act and as appropriations for discretionary accounts for purposes of the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) ADDITIONAL SPENDING LIMITS.—For purposes of section 302(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, in the following applicable fiscal years,

the following discretionary spending limits shall apply:

- (1) Fiscal year 2026, \$1,621,959,000,000.
- (2) Fiscal year 2027, \$1,638,179,000,000.
- (3) Fiscal year 2028, \$1,654,560,000,000.
- (4) Fiscal year 2029, \$1,671,106,000,000.

SEC. 102. SPECIAL ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024 AND 2025.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), if on or after January 1, 2024, there is in effect an Act making continuing appropriations for part of fiscal year 2024 for any discretionary budget account, the discretionary spending limits specified in subsection (c)(9) for fiscal year 2024 shall be adjusted in the final sequestration report, in accordance with paragraph (2), as follows:

“(A) For the revised security category, the amount that is equal to the total budget authority for such category for base funding, as published in the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for the applicable appropriations Acts for the preceding fiscal year (table 1–S of H.R. 2617, published on December 21, 2022), reduced by one percent.

“(B) For the revised non-security category, the amount that is equal to the total budget authority for such category for base funding as published in the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for the applicable appropriations Acts for the preceding fiscal year (table 1–S of H.R. 2617, published on December 21, 2022), reduced by one percent.

“(2) FINAL REPORT; SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—If the conditions specified in paragraph (1) are met during fiscal year 2024, the final sequestration report for such fiscal year pursuant to section 254(f)(1) and any order pursuant to section 254(f)(5) shall be issued on the earlier of—

“(A) 10 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Congressional Budget Office and 15 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Office of Management and Budget and the President, after the enactment into law of annual full-year appropriations for all budget accounts that normally receive such annual appropriations (or the enactment of the applicable full-year appropriations Acts without any provision for such accounts); or

“(B) April 30, 2024.

“(3) REVERSAL.—If, after January 1, 2024, there are enacted into law each of the full year discretionary appropriation Acts, then the adjustment to the applicable discretionary spending limits in paragraph (1) shall have no force or effect, and the discretionary spending limits for the revised security category and revised nonsecurity category for the applicable fiscal year shall be such limits as in effect on December 31 of the applicable fiscal year.

“(e) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), if on or after January 1, 2025, there is in effect an Act making continuing appropriations for part of fiscal year 2025 for any discretionary budget account, the discretionary spending limits specified in subsection (c)(10) for fiscal year 2025 shall be adjusted in the final sequestration report, in accordance with paragraph (2), as follows:

“(A) for the revised security category, the amount calculated for such category in section (d)(1)(A); and

“(B) for the revised non-security category, the amount calculated for each category in section (d)(1)(B).

“(2) FINAL REPORT; SEQUESTRATION ORDER.—If the conditions specified in paragraph (1) are met during fiscal year 2025, the

final sequestration report for such fiscal year pursuant to section 254(f)(1) and any order pursuant to section 254(f)(5) shall be issued on the earlier of—

“(A) 10 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Congressional Budget Office, and 15 days, not including weekends and holidays, for the Office of Management and Budget and the President, after the enactment into law of annual full-year appropriations for all budget accounts that normally receive such annual appropriations (or the enactment of the applicable full-year appropriations Acts without any provision for such accounts); or

“(B) April 30, 2025.

“(3) REVERSAL.—If, after January 1, 2025, there are enacted into law each of the full year discretionary appropriation Acts, then the adjustment to the applicable discretionary spending limits in paragraph (1) shall have no force or effect, and the discretionary spending limits for the revised security category and revised nonsecurity category for the applicable fiscal year shall be such limits as in effect on December 31 of the applicable fiscal year.”

SEC. 103. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF PREVIOUSLY ENACTED EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 905(c) of division J of Public Law 117–58 and section 23005(c) of division B of Public Law 117–159, Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217, and sections 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects for any fiscal year for the amounts specified in subsection (b) shall not count for purposes of section 251 of such Act.

(b) AMOUNTS.—The amounts specified in this subsection are—

(1) amounts designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, in division B of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (Public Law 117–159);

(2) amounts designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58); and

(3) amounts designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, and section 1(e) of H. Res. 1151 (117th Congress) in section 443(b) in division G of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (Public Law 117–328).

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 111. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2024.—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 2024, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2024 and for fiscal years 2025 through 2033.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—In the House of Representatives, the Chair of the Committee on the Budget shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 consistent with discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c)(9) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as added by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, and committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 for current law mandatory budget authority and outlays, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(2) for all committees of the House of Representatives other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 and for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2033 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted, to the extent practicable, for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2024 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal year 2024 and for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2033 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted, to the extent practicable, for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels included in the statement referred to in subsection (b)—

(1) to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office’s updates to its baseline for fiscal years 2024 through 2033; or

(2) for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2028 or fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2033.

(d) EXPIRATION.—Subsections (a) through (c) shall no longer apply if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 112. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide an advance appropriation.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, activities or accounts identified in lists submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chair of the Committee on the Budget—

(1) for fiscal year 2025, under the heading “ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority;

(2) for fiscal year 2025, under the heading “VETERANS ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS”; and

(3) for fiscal year 2025, under the heading “INDIAN HEALTH ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS” in an aggregate amount not to exceed the total budget authority provided for such accounts for fiscal

year 2024 in bills or joint resolutions making appropriations for fiscal year 2024.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2024, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available following fiscal year 2024.

(d) EXPIRATION.—The preceding subsections of this section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 113. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

This title is enacted by the House of Representatives—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change such rules (so far as relating to the House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE SENATE

SEC. 121. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2024.—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2024 and for fiscal years 2025 through 2033.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act that includes—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, committee allocations for fiscal year 2024 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033, consistent with the May 2023 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2024 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033, consistent with the May 2023 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on

the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(5) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033, consistent with the May 2023 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633, 642); and

(6) a statement under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” for the purpose of enforcing section 123 of this title.

(c) ADDITIONAL MATTER.—The statement referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2024 the deficit-neutral reserve fund in section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, updated by 2 fiscal years.

(d) EXPIRATION.—This section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 122. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2025.—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), after April 15, 2024, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2025 and for fiscal years 2026 through 2034.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—After April 15, 2024, but not later than May 15, 2024, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record that includes—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, committee allocations for fiscal year 2025 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2025 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending

on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(5) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633, 642); and

(6) a statement under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” for the purpose of enforcing section 123 of this title.

(c) ADDITIONAL MATTER.—The statement referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2025 the deficit-neutral reserve fund in section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, updated by 3 fiscal years.

(d) EXPIRATION.—This section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2024 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2024 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2025 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2025.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(A) for fiscal years 2025 and 2026, for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in a statement submitted to the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(B) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

(C) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(D) for the Department of Health and Human Services for the Indian Health Services and Indian Health Facilities accounts—

(i) for fiscal year 2025, in an amount that is not more than the amount provided for fiscal year 2024 in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2023 or 2024 for programs, projects, and activities that are not prohibited from using amounts provided for fiscal year 2024 in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2023; and

(ii) for fiscal year 2026, in an amount that is not more than the amount provided for fiscal year 2025 in a bill or joint resolution

making appropriations for fiscal year 2024 or 2025 for programs, projects, and activities that are not prohibited from using amounts provided for fiscal year 2025 in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2024.

(3) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(4) **FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this subsection, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment between the Houses shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this paragraph), no further amendment shall be in order.

(b) **EXPIRATION.**—Subsection (a) shall terminate on the date on which a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2024 or for fiscal year 2025 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 124. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

This title is enacted by the Senate—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rules (so far as relating to the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

DIVISION B—SAVE TAXPAYER DOLLARS

TITLE I—RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS

SEC. 1. Each rescission made by this title shall be applied to the unobligated balances for each applicable appropriation as of the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 2. The unobligated balances from the following appropriations, in the following amounts and subject to the conditions specified below, are hereby permanently rescinded:

(1) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title III of division A of Public Law 116-123, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$59,000,000.

(2) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public

Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title V of division A of Public Law 116-127, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated.

(3) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$2,127,000,000 and—

(A) any funds that were transferred and merged with the Covered Countermeasure Process Fund authorized by section 319F-4 of the Public Health Service Act; and

(B) any funds that were transferred and merged with funds made available under the heading “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” pursuant to section 18113 of title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136.

(4) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available in the first paragraph under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title I of division B of Public Law 116-139, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$300,000,000, which shall remain available for necessary expenses for program administration and oversight.

(5) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available in the second paragraph under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title I of division B of Public Law 116-139, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$243,000,000 and any funds that were transferred and merged with funds made available under the heading “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” pursuant to section 103 of title I of division B of Public Law 116-139.

(6) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$205,000,000.

(7) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—Wide Activities and Program Support” in title III of division A of Public Law 116-123, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$195,000,000 and any funds that were transferred and merged with the Infectious Diseases Rapid Response Reserve Fund established by section 231 of division B of Public Law 115-245.

(8) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—Wide Activities and Program Support” in title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$446,000,000 and any funds that were transferred and merged with the Infectious Diseases Rapid Response Reserve Fund established by section 231 of division B of Public Law 115-245.

(9) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—Wide Activities and Program Support” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260, including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated, with the exception of \$177,000,000.

(10) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available under the heading “National Institutes of Health—National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases” in title III of division A of Public Law 116-123,

including any funds transferred from such heading that remain unobligated.

(11) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available to “Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—Program Management” in title VIII of division B of Public Law 116-136.

(12) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2301 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$103,000,000.

(13) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2302 of Public Law 117-2.

(14) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2303 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$69,000,000.

(15) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2401 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$7,323,000,000.

(16) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2402 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$714,000,000.

(17) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2403 of Public Law 117-2.

(18) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2501 of Public Law 117-2.

(19) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2502 of Public Law 117-2.

(20) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2601 of Public Law 117-2.

(21) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2602 of Public Law 117-2.

(22) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2603 of Public Law 117-2.

(23) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2604 of Public Law 117-2.

(24) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2605 of Public Law 117-2.

(25) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2703 of Public Law 117-2.

(26) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2704 of Public Law 117-2.

(27) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2705 of Public Law 117-2.

(28) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2711 of Public Law 117-2.

(29) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2712 of Public Law 117-2.

(30) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 2801 of Public Law 117-2.

(31) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 3101 of Public Law 117-2, with the exception of \$793,000,000.

(32) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 511A(a) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9101 of Public Law 117-2.

(33) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 1150C(a) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9911 of Public Law 117-2.

(34) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 1947(e) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9813 of Public Law 117-2.

(35) All of the unobligated balances of funds made available by section 1862(g)(2) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9401 of Public Law 117-2.

SEC. 3. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Agricultural Programs—Office of the Secretary" in title I of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 4. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 751 in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded, except for funds made available by section 601 of division HH of Public Law 117-328.

SEC. 5. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 753 in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 6. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 754 in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 7. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 762(i) in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 8. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 764(f) in title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 9. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 1001 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 10. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 4027 of title IV of division A of Public Law 116-136, \$200,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 11. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 4120 of title IV of division A of Public Law 116-136, \$295,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 12. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7301(c) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 13. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 104A(m) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4701 et seq.), as added by section 522 of title V of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of \$284,500,000, which shall remain available for necessary expenses associated with the making of awards announced prior to the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 3301(a)(2)(A) of Public Law 117-2, \$150,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 15. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 411 in subtitle A of title IV of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 16. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by subsection (a) of section 2206 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of amounts allocated under paragraphs (6) and (7) of subsection (b) of such section.

SEC. 17. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2001 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 18. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2002 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 19. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2003 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 20. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Federal Highway Administration—Highway Infrastructure Programs" in title IV of division M of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 21. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7202(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 22. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by sections 5002(b) and 5006(a)(2) of Public Law 117-2, including any amounts transferred and merged with "Small Business Administration—Disaster Loans Program Account" pursuant to section 90007(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 117-58 that remain unobligated, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 23. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Independent Agencies—Small Business Administration—Disaster Loans Program Account" in title II of division B of Public Law 116-139 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 24. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2118(a) of title II of division A of Public Law 116-136, as added by section 9032 of Public Law 117-2, \$1,000,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 25. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing—Tenant-Based Rental Assistance" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 26. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Public and Indian Housing—Native American Programs" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 27. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Housing for Persons with Disabilities" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 28. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Project-Based Rental Assistance" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 29. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Housing and Urban Development—Housing Programs—Housing for the Elderly" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 30. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 3208(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 31. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and Expenses" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 32. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—Essential Air Service" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 33. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration—Grants-In-Aid for Airports" in title XII of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 34. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7101 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 35. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7102(a)(1)

of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 36. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 501(a)(1) of title V of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 37. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 9601(d)(1) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 38. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 4009 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 39. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Justice—General Administration—Justice Information Sharing Technology" in title II of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 40. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of Defense—Procurement—Defense Production Act Purchases" in title III of division B of Public Law 116-136, \$61,381,230 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 41. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of State—Administration of Foreign Affairs—Diplomatic Programs" in title XI of division B of Public Law 116-136 and subsequently transferred to the Department of State's "Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs" account are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 42. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Bilateral Economic Assistance—Department of State—Migration and Refugee Assistance" in title XI of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 43. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—International Disaster Assistance" in title XI of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 44. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Department of State—Administration of Foreign Affairs—Sudan Claims" in title IX of division K of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 45. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Economic Support Fund" in title IX of division K of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 46. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Federal Communications Commission—Salaries and Expenses" in title V of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 47. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading "Independent Agencies—Small Business Administration—Emergency EIDL Grants" in title II of division B of Public Law 116-139 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 48. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 323(d)(1)(B) of title III of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 49. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 323(d)(1)(E)(i) of title III of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 50. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 902(c)(5) of title IX of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 51. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 905(b) of title IX of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 52. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 5003(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 53. The unobligated balances of amounts described in the tenth proviso under the heading “Administration for Children and Families—Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 54. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2201(b) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 55. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2204(d)(1) of Public Law 117-2, including any amounts made available by amendments made by such section, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 56. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2205 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 57. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2912(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 58. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 403(c) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 9201 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 59. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 816(f) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d(f)), as added by section 11004 of Public Law 117-2, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 60. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “Rural Development Programs—Rural Utilities Service—Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program” in title I of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 61. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 752 of title VII of division N of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 62. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 1002(c) of Public Law 117-2, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 63. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 3207(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 64. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science” in title IV of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 65. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 6003 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 66. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 11002(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 67. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “Department of Education—Departmental Management—Program Administration” in title III of division M of Public Law 116-260 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 68. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2007 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 69. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2010 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 70. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2011 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 71. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 11006 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 72. Of the unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 6002(a) of Public Law 117-2, all but \$22,000,000 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 73. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2101(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of \$1,892,718 for the Office of the Solicitor within the Departmental Management account and amounts allocated for the Office of Inspector General under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of such section.

SEC. 74. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2110(g) of Public Law 116-136, as amended, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 75. The unobligated balances of amounts made available under the heading “General Services Administration—General Activities—Federal Citizen Services Fund” in title V of division B of Public Law 116-136 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 76. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2021 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 77. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2022 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 78. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2023 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 79. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2(c)(2)(D)(v) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(v)), as amended, are hereby permanently rescinded.

SEC. 80. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 2904 of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded, with the exception of \$500,000 for the Railroad Retirement Board Office of Inspector General.

SEC. 81. The unobligated balances of amounts made available by section 7404(a) of Public Law 117-2 are hereby permanently rescinded.

TITLE II—FAMILY AND SMALL BUSINESS TAXPAYER PROTECTION

SEC. 251. RESCISSION OF CERTAIN BALANCES MADE AVAILABLE TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

Of the unobligated balances of amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for activities of the Internal Revenue Service by paragraphs (1)(A)(ii), (1)(A)(iii), (1)(B), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 10301 of Public Law 117-169 (commonly known as the “Inflation Reduction Act of 2022”) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, \$1,389,525,000 are hereby rescinded.

TITLE III—STATUTORY ADMINISTRATIVE PAY-AS-YOU-GO

SEC. 261. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Administrative Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2023”.

SEC. 262. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “administrative action” means a “rule” as defined in section 804(3) of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term “agency” means any authority of the United States that is an “agency” under section 3502(1) of title 44, United States Code, other than those considered to be independent regulatory agencies, as defined in section 3502(5) of such title;

(3) the term “covered discretionary administrative action” means a discretionary administrative action that would affect direct spending;

(4) the term “direct spending” has the meaning given that term in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c));

(5) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(6) the term “discretionary administrative action”—

(A) means any administrative action that is not required by law; and

(B) includes an administrative action required by law for which an agency has discretion in the manner in which to implement the administrative action; and

(7) the term “increase direct spending” means that the amount of direct spending would increase relative to—

(A) the most recently submitted projection of the amount of direct spending presented in baseline estimates as defined in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, under—

(i) the budget of the President submitted under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; or

(ii) the supplemental summary of the budget submitted under section 1106 of title 31, United States Code;

(B) with respect to a discretionary administrative action that is incorporated into the applicable projection described in subparagraph (A) and for which a proposal has not been submitted under section 263(a)(2)(A), a projection of the amount of direct spending if no administrative action were taken; or

(C) with respect to a discretionary administrative action described in paragraph (6)(B), a projection of the amount of direct spending under the least costly implementation option reasonably identifiable by the agency that meets the requirements under the statute.

SEC. 263. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS THAT AFFECT DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before an agency may finalize any covered discretionary administrative action, the head of the agency shall submit to the Director for review written notice regarding the covered discretionary administrative action, which shall include an estimate of the budgetary effects of the covered discretionary administrative action.

(2) INCREASING DIRECT SPENDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the covered discretionary administrative action would increase direct spending, the written notice submitted by the head of the agency under paragraph (1) shall include a proposal to undertake 1 or more other administrative actions that would provide a reduction in direct spending greater than or equal to the increase in direct spending attributable to the covered discretionary administrative action.

(B) REVIEW.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall determine whether the reduction in direct spending in a proposal in a written notice from an agency under subparagraph (A) is greater than or equal to the increase in direct spending attributable to the covered discretionary administrative action to which the written notice relates.

(ii) NO OFFSET.—If the written notice regarding a proposed covered discretionary administrative action that would increase direct spending does not include a proposal to offset the increased direct spending as determined in clause (i), the Director shall return the written notice to the agency for resubmission in accordance with this title.

(b) NONDISCRETIONARY ACTIONS.—If an agency determines that an administrative action that would increase direct spending is required by law and therefore is not a covered discretionary administrative action, before the agency finalizes that administrative action, the head of the agency shall—

(1) submit to the Director a written opinion by the general counsel of the agency, or the equivalent employee of the agency, explaining that legal conclusion;

(2) submit to the Director a projection of the amount of direct spending under the least costly implementation option reasonably identifiable by the agency that meets the requirements under the statute; and

(3) consult with the Director regarding implementation of the administrative action.

(c) PROJECTIONS.—Any projection for purposes of this title shall be conducted in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11, or any successor thereto.

SEC. 264. ISSUANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDANCE.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue instructions regarding the implementation of this title, including how covered discretionary administrative actions that increase direct spending and nontax receipts will be evaluated.

SEC. 265. WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director may waive the requirements of section 263 if the Director concludes that the waiver—

(1) is necessary for the delivery of essential services; or

(2) is necessary for effective program delivery.

(b) PUBLICATION.—Any waiver determination under subsection (a) shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 266. EXEMPTION.

This title shall not apply to administrative actions with direct spending cost of less than—

(1) \$1,000,000,000 over the 10-year period beginning with the current year; or

(2) \$100,000,000 in any given year during such 10-year period.

SEC. 267. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

No determination, finding, action, or omission under this title shall be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 268. SUNSET.

This title shall expire on December 31, 2024.

SEC. 269. GAO REPORT.

Within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report on the implementation of this title.

SEC. 270. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT.

Section 801(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B)” the following: “, and shall in addition include an assessment of the agency’s compliance with such requirements of the Administrative Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2023 as may be applicable”.

TITLE IV—TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS; RESUMPTION OF ACCRUAL OF INTEREST AND COLLECTIONS

SEC. 271. TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS; RESUMPTION OF ACCRUAL OF INTEREST AND COLLECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sixty days after June 30, 2023, the waivers and modifications described in subsection (c) shall cease to be effective.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Except as expressly authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education may not use any authority to implement an extension of any executive action or rule specified in subsection (c).

(c) WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS DESCRIBED.—The waivers and modifications described in this subsection are the waivers and modifications of statutory and regulatory provisions relating to an extension of the suspension of payments on certain loans and waivers of interest on such loans under section 3513 of the CARES Act (20 U.S.C. 1001 note)—

(1) described by the Department of Education in the Federal Register on October 12, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 61513 et seq.); and

(2) most recently extended in the announcement by the Department of Education on November 22, 2022.

DIVISION C—GROW THE ECONOMY TITLE I—TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY FAMILIES

SEC. 301. RECALIBRATION OF THE CASELOAD REDUCTION CREDIT.

Section 407(b)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 607(b)(3)) is amended in each of subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B), by striking “2005” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 302. PILOT PROJECTS FOR PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY BY MEASURING WORK OUTCOMES.

Section 411 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 611) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PILOT PROJECTS FOR PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY BY MEASURING WORK OUTCOMES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary may select up to 5 States to which a grant is made under section 403(a) for a fiscal year to negotiate performance benchmarks for work and family outcomes for recipients of assistance under the State program funded under this part, and programs funded with qualified State expenditures. The Secretary shall issue guidance on how States apply for participation in the pilot. The benchmarks shall include—

“(A) the percentage of work-eligible individuals under the State program funded under this part who are in unsubsidized employment during the 2nd quarter after exiting the program;

“(B) the level of earnings of such individuals in the 2nd and 4th quarters after exit; and

“(C) other indicators of family stability and well-being as established by the Secretary.

“(2) LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE BENCHMARK.—The Secretary and a State selected under paragraph (1) shall agree to the requisite level of performance on these benchmarks after developing baseline data in the State and comparative data in other States.

“(3) FAILURE OF STATE TO MEET BENCHMARK.—If a State fails to meet a measured benchmark standard agreed to under paragraph (2) for 2 successive fiscal years, the State, in order to continue in the pilot shall enter into a plan with the Secretary to achieve the required level of performance or, if mutually agreed to, adjust the benchmark

based on new information about the feasibility of meeting such benchmark.

“(4) DURATION.—The pilot under this subsection shall be in effect for 6 fiscal years, with one year to establish benchmark data and negotiate targets and five years to measure performance against the targets, and shall supersede the requirements under section 407 for such fiscal years, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

“(5) APPLICATION OF PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REDUCE ASSISTANCE FOR RECIPIENTS REFUSING WITHOUT GOOD CAUSE TO WORK.—For purposes of section 409(a)(14), a State operating a pilot must have a system for reducing the amount of assistance payable to a family if an individual refuses, without good cause (including for reasons described in 407(e)(2)), to engage in any such activities as the State has required of such an individual. A State without such a system shall be considered to have failed to comply with the requirements of section 407(e) for so long as the failure to comply continues.

“(6) COLLECTION OF PERFORMANCE DATA.—Each State selected under paragraph (1), in consultation with the Secretary, shall collect and submit to the Secretary data on the performance of the State operating such a pilot program.

“(7) REPORTS.—

“(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the status of the program under this section.

“(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date on which the programs under this section have terminated, the Secretary shall submit a comprehensive report to Congress on outcomes achieved under such programs.”.

SEC. 303. ELIMINATION OF SMALL CHECKS SCHEME.

Section 407(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 607(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING CALCULATION OF THE MINIMUM PARTICIPATION RATE.—The Secretary shall determine participation rates under this section without regard to any individual engaged in work in a family that receives no assistance under this part and less than \$35 in assistance funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i)).”.

SEC. 304. REPORTING OF WORK OUTCOMES.

Section 411 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 611), as amended by section 302, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) REPORTING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State, in consultation with the Secretary, shall collect and submit to the Secretary the information necessary for each indicator described in paragraph (2), for fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—The indicators described in this paragraph for a fiscal year are the following:

“(A) The percentage of individuals who were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the exit.

“(B) The percentage of individuals who were work-eligible individuals who were in unsubsidized employment in the second quarter after the exit, who are also in unsubsidized employment during the fourth quarter after the exit.

“(C) The median earnings of individuals who were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who are in unsubsidized employment during the second quarter after the exit.

“(D) The percentage of individuals who have not attained 24 years of age, are attending high school or enrolled in an equivalency program, and are work-eligible individuals or were work-eligible individuals as of the time of exit from the program, who obtain a high school degree or its recognized equivalent while receiving assistance under the State program funded under this part or within 1 year after the exit.

“(3) DEFINITION OF EXIT.—In paragraph (2), the term ‘exit’ means, with respect to a State program funded under this part, ceases to receive assistance under the program funded by this part.

“(4) REGULATIONS.—In order to ensure nationwide comparability of data, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor and with States, shall issue regulations governing the reporting of performance indicators under this subsection.”.

SEC. 305. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on October 1, 2024, except for sections 301 and 303 which shall take effect on October 1, 2025.

TITLE II—SNAP EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 311. MODIFICATION OF WORK REQUIREMENT EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(o)(3) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(6)(o)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) under 18 years of age; or

“(ii) in—

“(I) fiscal year 2023 over 51 years of age;

“(II) fiscal year 2024 over 53 years of age;

“(III) fiscal year 2025 and each fiscal year thereafter over 55 years of age.”;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “;”;

(4) adding at the end the following:

“(F) a homeless individual;

“(G) a veteran; or

“(H) an individual who is 24 years of age or younger and who was in foster care under the responsibility of a State on the date of attaining 18 years of age or such higher age as the State has elected under section 475(8)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 675(8)(B)(iii)).”.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) STATE AGENCY.—A state agency shall apply section 6(o)(3) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended by subsection (a), to any application for initial certification or recertification received starting 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SUNSET.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall cease to have effect on October 1, 2030.

SEC. 312. MODIFICATION OF GENERAL EXEMPTIONS.

Section 6(o)(6) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS” and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 2020 THROUGH 2023”;

(B) by striking “(F) through (H)” and inserting “(G) through (I)”;

(C) by striking “year,” and inserting “year through fiscal year 2023.”;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking “(or (E))” and inserting “, (E) or (F)”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H) as subparagraphs (G), (H), and (I), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—Subject to subparagraphs (G) through (I), for fiscal years 2024 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State agency may provide a number of ex-

emptions such that the average monthly number of exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 8 percent of the number of covered individuals in the State, as estimated by the Secretary under subparagraph (C), adjusted by the Secretary to reflect changes in the State’s caseload and the Secretary’s estimate of changes in the proportion of members of households that receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits covered by waivers granted under paragraph (4)”;

(5) in subparagraph (B), by striking “(H)” and inserting “(I)”;

(6) in subparagraph (C), by striking “(F) and (H)” and inserting “(G) and (I)”;

(7) in subparagraph (D), by striking “(F) through (H)” and inserting “(G) through (I)”;

and

(8) by adding at end the following:

“(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR EXEMPTION ADJUSTMENT.—During fiscal year 2024 and each subsequent fiscal year, nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to allow a State agency to accumulate unused exemptions to be provided beyond the subsequent fiscal year.”.

SEC. 313. SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM UNDER THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.

Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at end the following:

“That program includes as a purpose to assist low-income adults in obtaining employment and increasing their earnings. Such employment and earnings, along with program benefits, will permit low-income households to obtain a more nutritious diet through normal channels of trade by increasing food purchasing power for all eligible households who apply for participation.”.

SEC. 314. WAIVER TRANSPARENCY.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make public all available State waiver requests, including all supporting data from the State, and agency approvals of such requests, including relevant documentation on the utilization of waivers authorized under Section 6(o)(4)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)(4)(A)).

TITLE III—PERMITTING REFORM

SEC. 321. BUILDER ACT.

(a) PARAGRAPH (2) OF SECTION 102.—Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “inure” and inserting “ensure”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “inure” and inserting “ensure”;

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “consistent with the provisions of this Act and except where compliance would be inconsistent with other statutory requirements,” before “include in every”;

(B) by striking clauses (i) through (v) and inserting the following:

“(i) reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the proposed agency action;

“(ii) any reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

“(iii) a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed agency action, including an analysis of any negative environmental impacts of not implementing the proposed agency action in the case of a no action alternative, that are technically and economically feasible, and meet the purpose and need of the proposal;

“(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

“(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of Federal resources which would be involved in the proposed agency action should it be implemented.”; and

(C) by striking “the responsible Federal official” and inserting “the head of the lead agency”;

(4) in subparagraph (D), by striking “Any” and inserting “any”;

(5) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (I) as subparagraphs (G) through (L), respectively;

(6) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) ensure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussion and analysis in an environmental document;

“(E) make use of reliable data and resources in carrying out this Act;

“(F) consistent with the provisions of this Act, study, develop, and describe technically and economically feasible alternatives;”;

(7) in subparagraph (I), as amended, by inserting “consistent with the provisions of this Act,” before “recognize”.

(b) NEW SECTIONS.—Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 106. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW.

“(a) THRESHOLD DETERMINATIONS.—An agency is not required to prepare an environmental document with respect to a proposed agency action if—

“(1) the proposed agency action is not a final agency action within the meaning of such term in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code;

“(2) the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency’s categorical exclusions, another agency’s categorical exclusions consistent with section 109 of this Act, or another provision of law;

“(3) the preparation of such document would clearly and fundamentally conflict with the requirements of another provision of law; or

“(4) the proposed agency action is a non-discretionary action with respect to which such agency does not have authority to take environmental factors into consideration in determining whether to take the proposed action.

“(b) LEVELS OF REVIEW.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—An agency shall issue an environmental impact statement with respect to a proposed agency action requiring an environmental document that has a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

“(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—An agency shall prepare an environmental assessment with respect to a proposed agency action that does not have a reasonably foreseeable significant effect on the quality of the human environment, or if the significance of such effect is unknown, unless the agency finds that the proposed agency action is excluded pursuant to one of the agency’s categorical exclusions, another agency’s categorical exclusions consistent with section 109 of this Act, or another provision of law. Such environmental assessment shall be a concise public document prepared by a Federal agency to set forth the basis of such agency’s finding of no significant impact or determination that an environmental impact statement is necessary.

“(3) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In making a determination under this subsection, an agency—

“(A) may make use of any reliable data source; and

“(B) is not required to undertake new scientific or technical research unless the new scientific or technical research is essential

to a reasoned choice among alternatives, and the overall costs and time frame of obtaining it are not unreasonable.

“SEC. 107. TIMELY AND UNIFIED FEDERAL REVIEWS.

“(a) LEAD AGENCY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If there are two or more participating Federal agencies, such agencies shall determine, by letter or memorandum, which agency shall be the lead agency based on consideration of the—

“(i) magnitude of agency’s involvement;

“(ii) project approval or disapproval authority;

“(iii) expertise concerning the action’s environmental effects;

“(iv) duration of agency’s involvement; and

“(v) sequence of agency’s involvement.

“(B) JOINT LEAD AGENCIES.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A), the participating Federal agencies may appoint such State, Tribal, or local agencies as joint lead agencies as the involved Federal agencies shall determine appropriate. Joint lead agencies shall jointly fulfill the role described in paragraph (2).

“(2) ROLE.—A lead agency shall, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(A) supervise the preparation of an environmental document if, with respect to such proposed agency action, there is more than one participating Federal agency;

“(B) request the participation of each cooperating agency at the earliest practicable time;

“(C) in preparing an environmental document, give consideration to any analysis or proposal created by a cooperating agency;

“(D) develop a schedule, in consultation with each cooperating agency, the applicant, and such other entities as the lead agency determines appropriate, for completion of any environmental review, permit, or authorization required to carry out the proposed agency action;

“(E) if the lead agency determines that a review, permit, or authorization will not be completed in accordance with the schedule developed under subparagraph (D), notify the agency responsible for issuing such review, permit, or authorization of the discrepancy and request that such agency take such measures as such agency determines appropriate to comply with such schedule; and

“(F) meet with a cooperating agency that requests such a meeting.

“(3) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The lead agency may, with respect to a proposed agency action, designate any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal to serve as a cooperating agency. A cooperating agency may, not later than a date specified in the schedule established by the lead agency, submit comments to the lead agency.

“(4) REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION.—Any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency with respect to a proposed agency action under paragraph (1) may submit a written request for such a designation to a participating Federal agency. An agency that receives a request under this paragraph shall transmit such request to each participating Federal agency and to the Council.

“(5) COUNCIL DESIGNATION.—

“(A) REQUEST.—If the participating Federal agencies are unable to agree on the designation of a lead agency within 45 days of the request under paragraph (4), then the Federal, State, Tribal or local agency or person that is substantially affected by the lack of a designation of a lead agency may re-

quest that the Council designate a lead agency. Such request shall consist of—

“(i) a precise description of the nature and extent of the proposed agency action; and

“(ii) a detailed statement with respect to each participating Federal agency and each factor listed in paragraph (1) regarding which agency should serve as lead agency.

“(B) TRANSMISSION.—The Council shall transmit a request received under subparagraph (A) to each participating Federal agency.

“(C) RESPONSE.—A participating Federal agency may, not later than 20 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), submit to the Council a response to such request.

“(D) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 40 days after the date of the submission of a request under subparagraph (A), the Council shall designate the lead agency with respect to the relevant proposed agency action.

“(b) ONE DOCUMENT.—To the extent practicable, if a proposed agency action will require action by more than one Federal agency and the lead agency has determined that it requires preparation of an environmental document, the lead and cooperating agencies shall evaluate the proposal in a single environmental document.

“(c) REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—Each notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement under section 102 shall include a request for public comment on alternatives or impacts and on relevant information, studies, or analyses with respect to the proposed agency action.

“(d) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED.—Each environmental document shall include a statement of purpose and need that briefly summarizes the underlying purpose and need for the proposed agency action.

“(e) PAGE LIMITS.—

“(1) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an environmental impact statement shall not exceed 150 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(B) EXTRAORDINARY COMPLEXITY.—An environmental impact statement for a proposed agency action of extraordinary complexity shall not exceed 300 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(2) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS.—An environmental assessment shall not exceed 75 pages, not including any citations or appendices.

“(f) SPONSOR PREPARATION.—A lead agency shall prescribe procedures to allow a project sponsor to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the supervision of the agency. Such agency may provide such sponsor with appropriate guidance and assist in the preparation. The lead agency shall independently evaluate the environmental document and shall take responsibility for the contents.

“(g) DEADLINES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to a proposed agency action, a lead agency shall complete, as applicable—

“(A) the environmental impact statement not later than the date that is 2 years after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 102(2)(C) requires the issuance of an environmental impact statement with respect to such action;

“(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

“(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental impact statement for such action; and

“(B) the environmental assessment not later than the date that is 1 year after the sooner of, as applicable—

“(i) the date on which such agency determines that section 106(b)(2) requires the preparation of an environmental assessment with respect to such action;

“(ii) the date on which such agency notifies the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for such action is complete; and

“(iii) the date on which such agency issues a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment for such action.

“(2) DELAY.—A lead agency that determines it is not able to meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) may extend such deadline, in consultation with the applicant, to establish a new deadline that provides only so much additional time as is necessary to complete such environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.

“(3) PETITION TO COURT.—

“(A) RIGHT TO PETITION.—A project sponsor may obtain a review of an alleged failure by an agency to act in accordance with an applicable deadline under this section by filing a written petition with a court of competent jurisdiction seeking an order under subparagraph (B).

“(B) COURT ORDER.—If a court of competent jurisdiction finds that an agency has failed to act in accordance with an applicable deadline, the court shall set a schedule and deadline for the agency to act as soon as practicable, which shall not exceed 90 days from the date on which the order of the court is issued, unless the court determines a longer time period is necessary to comply with applicable law.

“(h) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each lead agency shall annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report that—

“(A) identifies any environmental assessment and environmental impact statement that such lead agency did not complete by the deadline described in subsection (g); and

“(B) provides an explanation for any failure to meet such deadline.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify, as applicable—

“(A) the office, bureau, division, unit, or other entity within the Federal agency responsible for each such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement;

“(B) the date on which—

“(i) such lead agency notified the applicant that the application to establish a right-of-way for the major Federal action is complete;

“(ii) such lead agency began the scoping for the major Federal action; or

“(iii) such lead agency issued a notice of intent to prepare the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement for the major Federal action; and

“(C) when such environmental assessment and environmental impact statement is expected to be complete.

“SEC. 108. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.

“When an agency prepares a programmatic environmental document for which judicial review was available, the agency may rely on the analysis included in the programmatic environmental document in a subsequent environmental document for related actions as follows:

“(1) Within 5 years and without additional review of the analysis in the programmatic environmental document, unless there are

substantial new circumstances or information about the significance of adverse effects that bear on the analysis.

“(2) After 5 years, so long as the agency re-evaluates the analysis in the programmatic environmental document and any underlying assumption to ensure reliance on the analysis remains valid.

“SEC. 109. ADOPTION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.

“An agency may adopt a categorical exclusion listed in another agency’s NEPA procedures for a category of proposed agency actions for which the categorical exclusion was established consistent with this paragraph. The agency shall—

“(1) identify the categorical exclusion listed in another agency’s NEPA procedures that covers a category of proposed actions or related actions;

“(2) consult with the agency that established the categorical exclusion to ensure that the proposed adoption of the categorical exclusion to a category of actions is appropriate;

“(3) identify to the public the categorical exclusion that the agency plans to use for its proposed actions; and

“(4) document adoption of the categorical exclusion.

“SEC. 110. E-NEPA.

“(a) PERMITTING PORTAL STUDY.—The Council on Environmental Quality shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress within 1 year of the enactment of this Act on the potential for online and digital technologies to address delays in reviews and improve public accessibility and transparency under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)) including, but not limited to, a unified permitting portal that would—

“(1) allow applicants to—

“(A) submit required documents or materials for their project in one unified portal;

“(B) upload and collaborate with the applicable agencies to edit documents in real-time, as required;

“(C) upload and display visual features such as video, animation, geographic information system displays, and three-dimensional renderings; and

“(D) track the progress of individual applications;

“(2) include a cloud based, digital tool for more complex reviews that would enhance interagency coordination in consultation by—

“(A) centralizing, across all necessary agencies, the data, visuals, and documents, including but not limited to geographic information system displays, other visual renderings, and completed reports and analyses necessary for reviews;

“(B) streamlining communications between all necessary agencies and the applicant;

“(C) allowing for comments and responses by and to all necessary agencies in one unified portal;

“(D) generating analytical reports to aid in organizing and cataloguing public comments; and

“(E) be accessible on mobile devices;

“(3) boost transparency in agency processes and present information suitable for a lay audience, including but not limited to—

“(A) scientific data and analysis; and

“(B) anticipated agency process and timeline; and

“(4) include examples describing how at least five permits would be reviewed and processed through this portal.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality to carry out the study directed by this section.

“SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—The term ‘categorical exclusion’ means a category of actions that a Federal agency has determined normally does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(C).

“(2) COOPERATING AGENCY.—The term ‘cooperating agency’ means any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency that has been designated as a cooperating agency under section 107(a)(3).

“(3) COUNCIL.—The term ‘Council’ means the Council on Environmental Quality established in title II.

“(4) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.—The term ‘environmental assessment’ means an environmental assessment prepared under section 106(b)(2).

“(5) ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ‘environmental document’ means an environmental impact statement, an environmental assessment, or a finding of no significant impact.

“(6) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The term ‘environmental impact statement’ means a detailed written statement that is required by section 102(2)(C).

“(7) FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—The term ‘finding of no significant impact’ means a determination by a Federal agency that a proposed agency action does not require the issuance of an environmental impact statement.

“(8) PARTICIPATING FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘participating Federal agency’ means a Federal agency participating in an environmental review or authorization of an action.

“(9) LEAD AGENCY.—The term ‘lead agency’ means, with respect to a proposed agency action—

“(A) the agency that proposed such action; or

“(B) if there are 2 or more involved Federal agencies with respect to such action, the agency designated under section 107(a)(1).

“(10) MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘major Federal action’ means an action that the agency carrying out such action determines is subject to substantial Federal control and responsibility.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘major Federal action’ does not include—

“(i) a non-Federal action—

“(I) with no or minimal Federal funding; or

“(II) with no or minimal Federal involvement where a Federal agency cannot control the outcome of the project;

“(ii) funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds which do not provide Federal agency compliance or enforcement responsibility over the subsequent use of such funds;

“(iii) loans, loan guarantees, or other forms of financial assistance where a Federal agency does not exercise sufficient control and responsibility over the subsequent use of such financial assistance or the effect of the action;

“(iv) business loan guarantees provided by the Small Business Administration pursuant to section 7(a) or (b) and of the Small Business Act (U.S.C. 636(a)), or title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

“(v) bringing judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions;

“(vi) extraterritorial activities or decisions, which means agency activities or decisions with effects located entirely outside of the jurisdiction of the United States; or

“(vii) activities or decisions that are non-discretionary and made in accordance with the agency’s statutory authority.

“(11) PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT.—The term ‘programmatic environ-

mental document’ means an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment analyzing all or some of the environmental effects of a policy, program, plan, or group of related actions.

“(12) PROPOSAL.—The term ‘proposal’ means a proposed action at a stage when an agency has a goal, is actively preparing to make a decision on one or more alternative means of accomplishing that goal, and can meaningfully evaluate its effects.

“(13) SPECIAL EXPERTISE.—The term ‘special expertise’ means statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience.”.

SEC. 322. INTERREGIONAL TRANSFER CAPABILITY DETERMINATION STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Electric Reliability Organization (as that term is defined in section 215(a)(2) of the Federal Power Act), in consultation with each regional entity (as that term is defined in section 215(a)(7) of such Act) and each transmitting utility (as that term is defined in section 3(23) of such Act) that has facilities interconnected with a transmitting utility in a neighboring transmission planning region, shall conduct a study of total transfer capability as defined in section 37.6(b)(1)(vi) of title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, between transmission planning regions that contains the following:

(1) Current total transfer capability, between each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions.

(2) A recommendation of prudent additions to total transfer capability between each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions that would demonstrably strengthen reliability within and among such neighboring transmission planning regions.

(3) Recommendations to meet and maintain total transfer capability together with such recommended prudent additions to total transfer capability between each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions.

(b) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation shall deliver a study to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which shall publish the study required in subsection (a) in the Federal Register and seek public comments.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the end of the public comment period in subsection (b), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall submit a report on its conclusions to Congress and include recommendations, if any, for statutory changes.

SEC. 323. PERMITTING STREAMLINING FOR ENERGY STORAGE.

Section 41001(6)(A) of the FAST Act (42 U.S.C. 4370m(6)(A)) is amended by inserting “energy storage,” before “or any other sector”.

SEC. 324. EXPEDITING COMPLETION OF THE MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE.

(a) DEFINITION OF MOUNTAIN VALLEY PIPELINE.—In this section, the term “Mountain Valley Pipeline” means the Mountain Valley Pipeline project, as generally described and approved in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. CP16-10, CP19-477, and CP21-57.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION.—The Congress hereby finds and declares that the timely completion of construction and operation of the Mountain Valley Pipeline is required in the national interest. The Mountain Valley Pipeline will serve demonstrated natural gas demand in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Southeast regions, will increase the reliability of natural gas supplies and the availability of natural gas at reasonable prices, will allow natural gas producers to access additional markets

for their product, and will reduce carbon emissions and facilitate the energy transition.

(c) APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING AUTHORIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) Congress hereby ratifies and approves all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Mountain Valley Pipeline; and

(2) Congress hereby directs the Secretary of the Army, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior, and other agencies as applicable, as the case may be, to continue to maintain such authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

(d) EXPEDITED APPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 21 days after the date of enactment of this Act and for the purpose of facilitating the completion of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, the Secretary of the Army shall issue all permits or verifications necessary—

(1) to complete the construction of the Mountain Valley Pipeline across the waters of the United States; and

(2) to allow for the operation and maintenance of the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review any action taken by the Secretary of the Army, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or a State administrative agency acting pursuant to Federal law that grants an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or any other approval necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Mountain Valley Pipeline, including the issuance of any authorization, permit, extension, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval described in subsection (c) or (d) of this section for the Mountain Valley Pipeline, whether issued prior to, on, or subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, and including any lawsuit pending in a court as of the date of enactment of this section.

(2) The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any claim alleging the invalidity of this section or that an action is beyond the scope of authority conferred by this section.

(f) EFFECT.—This section supersedes any other provision of law (including any other section of this Act or other statute, any regulation, any judicial decision, or any agency guidance) that is inconsistent with the issuance of any authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval for the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

DIVISION D—INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

SEC. 401. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on January 1, 2025.

(b) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.—Effective

on January 2, 2025, the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased to the extent that—

(1) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on January 2, 2025, exceeds

(2) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) RESTORING CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY OVER THE NATIONAL DEBT.—

(1) EXTENSION LIMITED TO NECESSARY OBLIGATIONS.—An obligation shall not be taken into account under subsection (b)(1) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred pursuant to law by the Federal Government that required payment before January 2, 2025.

(2) PROHIBITION ON CREATION OF CASH RESERVE DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall not issue obligations during the period specified in subsection (a) for the purpose of increasing the cash balance above normal operating balances in anticipation of the expiration of such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this debate was a long time coming, not because it is complicated, but because Democrats couldn't accept the solution.

We are here at the eleventh hour, finally dealing with a debt limit on a bipartisan basis, because President Biden apparently needed 100 days to pick up the phone to talk to Republicans.

During those 100 days, the case for cutting spending as part of a debt ceiling increase has only grown stronger. We have seen the worst inflation crisis in a generation—the direct result of reckless spending—continue to rob the pocketbooks of working families. We have seen interest rates continue to rise, driving up the cost of purchasing a car, a home, or a small business loan.

Interest payments on our national debt are \$110 billion higher over the first 7 months of this fiscal year than they were over the same time last fis-

cal year. In other words, runaway spending is adding to our debt crisis on the front end and the back end.

Something else occurred during those 100 days. House Republicans took action. While the White House was saying they would only accept a blank check debt ceiling increase, an idea that did not and does not have the votes even in a Senate controlled by the President's own party, House Republicans passed a responsible plan to address the debt ceiling while cutting spending and supporting American workers.

We acted on behalf of working families who are tired of paying more to put gas in their cars, clothes on their backs, and food on their tables.

We acted on behalf of the small business owners who are desperate to remove the “help wanted” signs in their storefront windows.

We acted on behalf of the families trapped on government assistance to help provide them with a path to a more prosperous future.

One has to wonder, what was President Biden waiting for? A massive slowdown in the economy? We got that, too. In the first quarter of this year, economic growth slowed significantly to just over 1 percent.

However, these data points do not tell the full story. To get that, Mr. Speaker, you have to go into the communities across this country and listen to those on the front lines of the economy.

At the Ways and Means Committee, we have done just that. From West Virginia to Oklahoma, Georgia to New York, we have listened to American workers, families, farmers, and small business owners who have shared their concerns and their solutions.

At the heart of so much of what we have heard is the simple message: Stop spending money we do not have on policies that do not work.

According to a recent survey, 60 percent of the American people say that an increase in the Nation's debt limit ought to be accompanied by a reduction in the Nation's spending.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act is a step in responding to that request. It does much of what Republicans said we would do: put a check on Washington spending, claw back the pandemic-era funding that everyone should agree is no longer needed, take a bite out of the IRS' recent \$80 billion pay raise, severely dampen the regulatory administrative state, and lift more Americans out of poverty through commonsense work requirements for those who can work.

Does this bill do everything folks might want? No. However, I am reminded of a quote by Thomas Jefferson, where he said, in part: “The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches. We must be contented to secure what we can get from time to time and eternally press forward for what is yet to get.”

This bill keeps alive the precedent that was set decades ago that has been

upheld by Republicans and Democrats alike—even by President Biden when he was a Senator and when he was Vice President. That is, when it comes to addressing the Nation's debt limit, Congress and the White House need to come to the table to also help address the Nation's debt crisis.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that, as the chairman noted, he didn't have the whole story, so we intend to spend the next hour filling in the rest of the story.

We are here tonight because of a reckless position that was adopted by the majority that was prepared to take this Nation to the precipice of default. Thank goodness for Joe Biden's legislative skills, so we will not go over the edge. We will preserve the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, just think of what was being proposed here. At risk was the dollar as the international currency.

Do people have any idea what role treasuries play in terms of international transactions? The American dollar drives the world's economy, and they were prepared to take us over the edge with the reckless spending plan that they have.

Thanks to Leader JEFFRIES and the measured tone that he took, we find ourselves tonight with an agreement that we might not love—because it is not about perfection. I stopped telling people that I was perfect 46 years ago when I ran for the Springfield City Council. After one legislative session, I never professed to being perfect again.

There is give-and-take to negotiation, and it means precisely that you give and you take. That is what we are acknowledging here this evening.

That old sage of political thought got it right. Mick Jagger said: "You get what you need."

Democrats can proudly say tonight that, with the help of Joe Biden, we protected Social Security, protected Medicare, protected Medicaid, and protected veterans benefits, all of which we have profoundly embraced over these years.

How did we get here? This is about the CARES Act that saved the American economy—22 million jobs gone, now 22 million jobs returned, and 9½ million jobs going unanswered. This was a manufactured crisis that brings us to this evening.

The President's experienced leadership in the face of divided government in this body is one-half of one-third of the Federal Government. We still have a ways to go.

Let's talk about why the bill ran up. It is on the CARES Act. Republicans voted for more defense spending. Some Republicans voted for the CHIPS Act, and some voted for the infrastructure bill.

Let me point out something, and I hope everybody is paying attention to

this: In December 2017, Republicans borrowed \$2.3 trillion to provide a tax cut to the wealthiest among us.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the great irony of that is? Even the wealthy wouldn't say they were asking for that tax cut. That is how we got here.

Their default on America act, in an effort to balance the budget on hard-working Americans' backs, tonight will be compromised. They targeted food security and healthcare while ignoring tax loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, do you think around here we might someday close one tax loophole?

The tax bill that we put out was well received everywhere, and it was pro-growth in nature.

Let me also point out something else by historical record this evening. Republicans are always in favor, Mr. Speaker, of balancing the budget when there is a Democratic President. That is the reality of it. Let's not forget who put us in this situation.

In the last 25 years, Republicans have voted for \$10 trillion worth of tax cuts to the top 1 percent: 2001, \$1.3 trillion; 2003, \$1 trillion; and then their tax plan in December 2017, \$2.3 trillion of borrowed money.

They wanted to take the American economy hostage, and Joe Biden, Leader JEFFRIES, and the Democratic Caucus pushed back to make sure that the position that we have tonight, which we overwhelmingly intend to support, is reasonable policy achieved because of the hard-nosed negotiating of President Biden and Leader JEFFRIES.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), who spent hours, days, and weeks in the negotiation process to help get us where we are today.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in debt limit negotiations, the U.S. Government will spend less money next year than it did this year.

This rates as one of the largest deficit reduction bills in American history, and it will fundamentally change the spending trajectory here in Washington with more work to do and more work ahead.

The bill contains spending cuts that take a step in the right direction toward restoring fiscal sanity in Washington. This agreement will return discretionary spending to 2022 levels.

Additionally, we set top-line spending at 1 percent annual growth over the next 6 years.

We also cut spending through the largest funding rescissions in American history, clawing back billions of dollars in unspent COVID money.

We institute the first-ever statutory paygo to hold President Biden accountable for his administrative actions. If this rule had been in place over the last

2 years, it would have checked regulatory overreach that has cost the economy at least \$1.5 trillion during Biden's Presidency.

This agreement will also change the way Washington operates by compelling a workable appropriations process.

Simply put, this legislation ends the Democrats' spending spree and fights inflation.

This deal will also help grow our economy and lift Americans out of poverty by instituting the strongest work requirements in a generation in some of our social safety net programs. These reforms will combat the labor shortages crippling small businesses by encouraging individuals to contribute to our society and economy while preserving these programs for those who need them most.

Another pro-growth solution in this bill is the transformational reforms to the permitting process and the environmental review process. Cutting this red tape will boost domestic energy production, lower costs for struggling American families, and set us on a path toward energy independence. Furthermore, it will be faster, cheaper, and easier to build things in America, large and small. Whether that is infrastructure, roads, bridges, new homes, new factories, so be it.

This legislation, though, is a product of divided government. Republicans only control the House of Representatives, not the Senate and not the White House. Throughout this process—which was long, laborious, and tough—it has been Speaker MCCARTHY's leadership and House Republicans leading. We passed a plan, and it was that plan and the Speaker's leadership that enabled these negotiations and this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most conservative spending package during my time in Congress. I am proud to support it, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

□ 1930

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for yielding, and I thank Mr. NEAL for his tremendous, steadfast leadership in this moment of crisis that was manufactured by extreme MAGA Republicans on the other side of the aisle.

I thank the distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee. I thank House Democrats for your steady hand, for your unity of purpose, for your efforts to make sure that we push back the extreme MAGA Republican efforts to jam rightwing cuts down the throats of the American people that would have undermined the health, the safety, and the economic well-being of everyday Americans.

From the very beginning, House Democrats were clear that we would not allow extreme MAGA Republicans to default on our debt, crash the economy, or trigger a job-killing recession.

Under the leadership of President Joe Biden, Democrats kept our promise. We will continue to do what is necessary to put people over politics.

The question that remains right now is what will the House Republican majority do?

It appears that you may have lost control of the floor of the House of Representatives.

Earlier today, 29 House Republicans voted to default on our Nation's debt and against an agreement that you negotiated.

It is an extraordinary act that indicates just the nature of the extremism that is out of control on the other side of the aisle.

Extreme MAGA Republicans attempted to take control of the House floor. Democrats took it back for the American people.

We will continue to do what is necessary under the leadership of President Joe Biden to build an economy that works for everyday Americans and push back against the extremism on the other side of the aisle.

Under the Trump administration, Democrats helped the former President avoid a default, raised the debt ceiling three times without gamesmanship, partisanship, or brinkmanship because Democrats put people over politics, even though we strongly disagreed with your reckless policies, as Chairman NEAL eloquently outlined.

In 2017, you passed the GOP tax scam where 83 percent of the benefits went to the wealthiest 1 percent here in America and caused our Nation to go \$2 trillion in debt to subsidize the lifestyles of the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected. It did nothing to lift up the economy for everyday Americans.

That was the case with your so-called tax cuts under Ronald Reagan, and that was the case under George W. Bush: failed policy; and trickle-down economics that has come to mean only one thing for everyday Americans. You may get a trickle, but you are guaranteed to stay down. Your policies have failed.

Yet despite that failure, despite the fact that you went \$2 trillion into debt to pass your GOP tax scam, House Democrats were there to make sure that America did not default. We were there then, and we are here today, to put people over politics.

I am thankful for my colleagues, for their work, for their commitment, for their patriotism, for their dedication, for their willingness to find the common ground necessary under the leadership of President Joe Biden, who did an extraordinary job under very difficult circumstances to protect values of importance to the American people, notwithstanding your threats to crash the economy, trigger a recession, and default on our debt.

President Biden understood, despite the hostage-taking situation that you unnecessarily thrust the country into, that we had an obligation, a responsibility

to avoid a catastrophic default. That is exactly what President Biden and Democrats have been able to do.

We also made clear that America would not find ourselves back in this hostage-taking situation. You passed the default on America act about a month ago that had extreme rightwing cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members, including leadership, are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I did not mention any single Member by name or any single individual on the other side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated on this floor, House Democrats will continue to put people over politics and push back against the extremism on the other side of the aisle.

I am thankful for the leadership of President Joe Biden in avoiding a catastrophic default. I am thankful for the leadership of President Joe Biden in finding a way to an agreement that will avoid a hostage-taking situation for the balance of the 118th Congress.

I am thankful for the leadership of President Joe Biden and House Democrats who protected Social Security, protected Medicare, protected Medicaid, protected veterans' benefits, protected education, protected public safety, and protected the American people from the draconian 22 percent across-the-board cuts that House Republicans were trying to visit on everyday Americans.

As a result of that effort, that leadership of President Joe Biden, we are going to be able to get through this hostage-taking situation and ensure that we can continue to build an economy that works for everyday Americans.

I thank House Democrats for their leadership. I thank House Democrats for their work. We will continue to show up and stand up and speak up without fear for everyday Americans to ensure that we can continue America's long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who has worked for days and weeks to get us to where we are today.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me explain why we are in the situation that we are in today. We have watched over the last year as my friends across the aisle have pushed through legislation called the IJJA, called the IRA, the CHIPS Act, the ARP, all these acronyms.

What does it mean to you?

What it means to the American people, Mr. Speaker, is it means that \$10 trillion in extra funds have been spent—\$10 trillion.

Let me tell you what that means. Today, a child born in America is going to inherit about \$4½ million in debt at their birth—\$4½ million—the amount of money they are going to pay over their lifetime, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

Right now, we have hit our credit card limit as a Nation. We don't have the ability to pay the monthly payment, and so we are in a quandary.

We have to figure out how we are going to raise that credit card limit. Just like you would do with your own family, you would have a conversation, Mr. Speaker, with your child. You would say, hey, how did you get yourself in this situation? We have to fix it.

The situation we are in right now, we have four options in front of us. There are four.

Number one, we can default on the debt. You cannot pay your credit card bill which means late payment penalties, interest rates going up, and you cause havoc on the American family.

The second option is you can say, hey, we are going to use this 14th Amendment thing that doesn't really exist, and the President can just do it on his own.

The third option is you can get all the moderates together, and they can do a relatively clean debt ceiling that just keeps that debt going up and up and up from \$32 trillion today to \$52 trillion over the next 20 years or so.

Mr. Speaker, 17½ cents of every tax dollar paid over the next 10 years is going to go towards interest on the debt—17½ cents.

The third option we have is, again, a clean debt ceiling, just running it up.

The fourth option we have, the one that is before us today, is the Fiscal Responsibility Act.

It is absolutely historic. For the first time ever, as a result of the strategic nature of this Speaker, we are in a situation where we have legislation before us that will result in the greatest savings in American history that will result in the greatest rescission, or taking back of funds, in our Nation's history.

We have legislation before us today that will strengthen and instill work requirements for welfare.

We have legislation before us today that will rescind funds for additional IRS agents because I have never had a constituent say, gosh, I wish I could have more audits.

We have legislation before us today that, for the first time in 40 years, streamlines the environmental process.

Mr. Speaker, here it is: Historic efforts to raise the deficit, \$6.5 trillion is how much this will result in. This one, \$2 trillion in savings. This is the option.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. There is not an imaginary fifth option, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't exist. Let's be honest with the American people. Support this legislation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the previous gentleman left out infrastructure

spending, the CARES Act, defense spending, the CHIPS Act, and the PACT Act, all of which had Republican support in terms of the expenditures.

Bill Clinton balanced the budget four straight times during his Presidency, and the money was given away with big tax cuts in 2001 and 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, protecting our country's full faith and credit requires accepting some unacceptable Republican demands.

As one cartoonist aptly described them, Republicans suffer from a form of deficit attention disorder. You see, when Republicans are in charge, they are absolutely obsessed with deficits.

Give them a little power, and their attention—poof. It just magically vanishes as they begin to deplete the Treasury with tax gifts for the well connected.

Like their multitrillion-dollar Trump tax giveaway, they are already planning in coming days to soon borrow more to reward those at the top.

Their boundless affection for tax cheats and for tax expenditures may increase the debt by even more than the cuts that they make today in education, healthcare, and environmental protection, which are so wrong.

As climate deniers, these Republicans sought to repeal our climate law but were held to one pipeline and a weakening of environmental review laws, a troubling setback that we can overcome.

We should be leaping forward instead of moving slowly. Ransom paid; America protected.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Responsibility Act.

Over 100 days ago, President Biden said he would not negotiate. Republicans, acting on behalf of this country, forced him to negotiate.

The bill alters our fiscal trajectory and helps remedy the Federal Government's insatiable spending problem.

This landmark legislation lowers nondefense discretionary spending and forces Congress to employ a functioning appropriations process.

More importantly, the measure doesn't result in new taxes and doesn't touch Social Security, Medicare, or veterans' benefits.

Is the bill perfect? Absolutely not.

Is it a step in the right direction? Absolutely. CBO scores a decrease in spending of \$1.9 trillion.

Let's not forget, Rome was not built in a day. It is now up to Republicans to make the necessary cuts to rein in our terrible spending and our terrible debt of \$31 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to support this landmark legislation.

□ 1945

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. THOMPSON), who spent 6 hours in front of the Rules Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people can't afford a default. Default on our debt would be catastrophic, an economic disaster with consequences for every one of our constituents. Congress can't let that happen.

This bill is not perfect, but thanks to President Biden's leadership, the bill before us achieves two key points: One, it prevents default, averting an economic disaster; and, two, it preserves not only key programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but also maintains virtually all House Democrats' achievements from the last 2 years, including the climate provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act, which I was proud to author with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee.

Despite where Republicans started, the President has negotiated legislation that protects Medicaid and the Inflation Reduction Act, the CHIPS Act, and the PACT Act, which provides for veterans' healthcare.

Now, I share some of my colleagues' concerns with the bill. I am particularly opposed to the Republicans' demand to cut mental health care. After climate change, mental health is the single biggest crisis in our country. There is no reason to cut critical funding for mental health.

Their cuts to the IRS will not decrease the deficit. It will increase the deficit. A fully funded IRS is in everyone's best interests.

Overall, this legislation is a compromise, which is what the American people expect and deserve from a divided government. Most important, it averts the catastrophe of a default.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, when I ran for Congress, I ran on the promise that I would use my position to reverse Washington's debt culture.

In my first term, I was in the minority party, and after 2 years of voting against Democrats' spending proposals, I finally today get the opportunity to vote "yes" on a comprehensive and thoughtful piece of legislation that will serve as the most significant spending cut in American history.

Does this bill achieve everything that I want? No, of course not. That is the reality. However, my support is a significant step forward, reversing our ballooning national debt.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act allows us to cut spending by \$2.1 trillion over the next decade. It is the largest deficit reduction ever. For the first time in 40 years, we will be able to address our permitting process, to be able to address our energy sector and transportation projects from crippling regulations.

This act represents the beginning of what is to come as Republicans govern

in a responsible, productive manner. We fought hard to get this agreement and blew through Democrats' red lines over and over again.

This isn't over. We can responsibly govern, and success today will bring more success in the future. I look forward to casting my vote "yes."

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), my neighbor.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, three times President Biden has had to deal with the Republican-manufactured default crisis around raising the debt ceiling.

Since 1960, Congress has dealt with the debt ceiling 78 times. During the Trump administration alone, it raised the debt ceiling three times without holding the American economy and its people hostage.

President Biden is to be commended for being the adult in the room and providing the leadership to prevent a catastrophic default that hurts the U.S. standing in the global economy and Americans here at home.

That does not excuse the behavior of the Republican majority in the House, who seek to normalize hostage taking in an effort to hurt programs that serve our people the most.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Biden for protecting Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits. The trust the American people placed in you has been validated again.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation.

The debt ceiling is one of the best pathways to address debt and deficits. In addition to immediate spending cuts and future spending caps, this bill includes provisions to prevent IRS from auditing families and small businesses and helps get Americans back to work.

My bill with Representative STEEL to rescind IRS funding was partially put into this bill. Even though we passed the entire bill by our majority in January, parts of it are in this bill, and House Republicans continue to work to protect every family and small business from IRS overreach.

This bill also modernizes TANF work requirements and ends the scheme of States sending small-dollar checks to people who are already working to artificially raise their TANF work rates. These changes will focus TANF dollars on those who need it the most and will push States to do more to connect work-capable adults with the 9.6 million job openings we have across our economy right now.

We have more to do to get our work done and our fiscal house in order. We need to ensure our economy always rewards hard work, and this bill is a great start.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), one of the most accomplished Speakers of the House in the history of America.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership. I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BOYLE), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the great remarks of our distinguished leader, Mr. HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who spoke earlier and captured so much of what is so important here today.

Mr. Speaker, our Constitution makes perfectly clear the validity of the public debt of the United States shall not be questioned. In the bipartisan budget agreement, we honor our sworn oaths as lawmakers to uphold this constitutional duty.

While I find this legislation objectionable, it will avert an unprecedented default, which would bring devastation to America's families: millions of jobs eliminated, trillions in savings erased, higher costs on loans, mortgages, car payments, credit card bills, and more.

Let us commend President Biden for his responsible leadership to prevent this unconscionable outcome while protecting Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid; protecting healthcare for our veterans as our Commander in Chief; protecting our progress on climate and infrastructure; and protecting our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, reaffirming to Americans that the full faith and credit of the United States shall not be questioned.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY). He has worked numerous hours, days—in fact, he has been working since January—to get to where we are today.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, let me first say how grateful I am to Congressmen GRAVES and MCHENRY. They have given their time and talents to this effort for more than a month. Our entire Conference and country owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Conference. They worked hard. When I went to see the President on February 1, I sat in the Oval Office right in the chair across from him. I said, Mr. President, the debt limit is coming.

At that time, Janet Yellen said it would be into maybe July, August.

I said that we should work together. I said that there are only two things, Mr. President: Never raise taxes, and we have to spend less than we spent this year.

He said that we would meet, but for 97 days we would never meet. It wasn't until this House took action to pass a bill. I sit back and I think for one moment, what if that bill didn't pass, because nothing passed in the Senate? If that bill had not passed, the only other option was sitting over here in a discharge petition. It just needs a few more signatures, and it would be: Just raise the debt. Just raise the debt.

But tonight is going to be different. Tonight, we are going to do something

we haven't done before. Tonight, we are going to give America hope. Tonight, we are going to vote for the largest savings in American history: over \$2.1 trillion. That is what we will vote on.

Mr. Speaker, every great nation that has overextended itself has collapsed. Mindful of this truth, George Washington said in his Farewell Address that a healthy public credit is a source of strength and security for a nation.

By that same token, an unhealthy debt burden is a source of weakness and insecurity.

President Washington's words ring true today. We are seeing the negative effects of runaway spending in real time: record inflation, rising interest rates, broken supply chains, and economic uncertainty.

Runaway spending is also making America more dependent on foreign debt holders. The total debt we owe to other countries is \$7.4 trillion. Countries like China are buying more of our farmland, more of our businesses, and more of our debt. This is unsustainable; but what is even worse, it is dangerous.

However, runaway spending is more than a national and economic security problem. My belief, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a moral problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is Halle. Halle was born at 9:58 a.m. on April 11 of this year. She weighed 6 pounds, 7 ounces. Her blue eyes, she got that from her dad. That button nose, she got that from her mom. The \$95,000 bill, she got that from Washington. Not a very good gift for a newborn. That is Halle's portion of the national debt.

Sadly, Halle is not alone. Every child who is born today owes \$95,000 in debt. Mr. Speaker, that is \$10,000 more in debt for every child since this President took office.

It reminds me of what Ronald Reagan once said: "When a business or an individual spends more than it makes, it goes bankrupt. When government does it, it sends you the bill."

Mr. Speaker, to continue Washington's spending addiction is both irresponsible and just wrong, so let's stop it. I will be honest, tonight's bill doesn't stop it, but for the first time, we begin to turn the ship. This shouldn't be our last. It shouldn't even be a debate. We should challenge each other for how could we put ourselves on a fiscal path even better.

For months, President Biden and Senator SCHUMER were adamant that they would not negotiate spending cuts. Mr. Speaker, I remember watching Senator SCHUMER on George Stephanopoulos one Sunday. He said: Just watch, we are going to break them. The Republicans can't get together. They can't pass a bill, and it is going to be a clean debt ceiling. You just watch.

The only person that didn't pass the bill was the person that made that quote. They demanded a clean debt limit, which really means they spend more, and you just pay more in taxes.

House Republicans said no. Over the past 4 months, we fought hard to change how Washington works. We stopped the Democrats from writing a blank check for more spending after the largest spending binge in American history that brought us some of the worst inflation our Nation has ever known.

We used the power we had to force the President to negotiate. You watched me day after day requesting to negotiate with the President. We produced a bill that in a divided government takes a step toward smaller government, less regulation, more economic growth, and more take-home pay.

Unlike previous Speakers, Members didn't have to pass the bill to find out what is in it. They had 72 hours to read it, and it is only 99 pages. Fifteen of those pages were just rescissions, just money that we had spent that sat there.

Here is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker: The Fiscal Responsibility Act is the biggest spending cut in American history.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, don't want to be on the wrong side of history. Yes, I could say I am going to vote "no" because there is something not in the bill. If I took that philosophy, I would never vote "yes."

I simply read the bills in front of me and decide: Is this good for the country? I would say that answer is easily yes.

□ 2000

Taxpayers will save an additional \$2.1 trillion. For the first time in more than a decade, Congress will spend less next year than this year.

In fact, the Fiscal Responsibility Act is the only bill that reduces overall spending, reduces nondefense spending, and reduces the deficit, unlike any other debt limit increase in recent history.

We are finally bending the curve on discretionary spending because of this bill. We are doing it while at the same time raising our national defense, with our veterans fully funded, with Social Security and Medicare preserved, and without raising a penny in new taxes.

That is a major victory.

Mr. Speaker, it is only part of the story. Tens of billions of dollars in unspent COVID funds will be clawed back for taxpayers because of this bill's spending rescissions, the largest in American history. If you add up all the rescissions in American history, this is larger than that. I think it is only common sense that if the pandemic is over, but billions of dollars have not been spent, why would you spend them now if the pandemic is over? Why don't we provide them back to the hard-working taxpayer that has to pay it, like Halle.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to some of the programs we are slashing:

\$400 million from the CDC's global health fund. Don't get worried because

that is not going to help you. That is your hardworking taxpayer money being sent to countries like China. I guess that is to help China be able to buy our bonds, and we will pay for their healthcare. I would rather focus on America.

What about work-capable adults without dependents? They are going to get a job. They are going to learn new skills, and they are going to earn a paycheck because of this bill's new welfare reforms. These reforms are going to change people's lives. When we vote on this bill today, somebody is going to have a better job tomorrow because of your vote. Families will be stronger and more self-sufficient. People will be lifted out of poverty.

Don't believe anyone who says our plan hurts America's social safety net. We are such a generous Nation, and when people fall on tough times, we help them. That will not change.

This is important: Assistance programs are supposed to be temporary, not permanent—a hand up, not a hand-out; a bridge to independence, not a barrier.

If you also vote for this bill tonight, new roads, bridges, highways, and pipelines are going to be built sooner and faster because of this bill's permitting reform.

Mr. Speaker, I know that is a bipartisan view. We talk about it all the time. We see it in our homes. We get frustrated that you will vote for a transportation bill, you will serve 10 years in the Congress, and once you leave, the person who follows you 6 years later will be at the groundbreaking because we spent all that time studying.

I think America wants to compete. They want to cut the red tape. They just want a fair process.

This is going to save families money and make America less dependent on China, changing America for the better for decades to come.

Finally, taxpayers will be more protected from harassment and costly new burdens. We rejected every single one of President Biden's demands for new tax hikes and new government mandates. Believe me, from the person sitting in the room with the President, he asked every single time.

Instead, this bill eliminates the funding that would have been spent this year to hire Biden's army of new IRS agents. Overall, we have cut more than \$20 billion from Biden's IRS slush fund. To date, they haven't been able to hire a single one of Biden's 87,000 new IRS agents. I will come back year after year to keep it that way because the government should work for you, not go after you.

Mr. Speaker, passing the Fiscal Responsibility Act is a crucial first step for putting America back on track. It does what is responsible for our children, what is possible in a divided government, and what is required by our principles and promises. Yes, it may not include everything we need to do,

but it is absolutely what we need to do right now.

Moving forward, House Republicans will build on its structural reforms. As we do, the American people can be confident in this: I am never giving up. I heard the detractors.

I am an optimist. I have to be. I sat there 15 rounds.

I am an optimist. I waited 97 days and listened to the President tell me he will never meet with me, but I woke up every morning thinking this might be the day.

I am an optimist. I watched division in this House, but tonight, we might come together and do something very big for this Nation.

Don't mistake that it is the solution. It is the beginning. We should wake up the next morning on how we can do even better tomorrow. You see, I will never give up on the American people, and I will never give up on keeping our Commitment to America.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a champion of the Inflation Reduction Act and the tax credits that were included.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how the Republicans can make political drama appear smaller than life: major questions with extremists are reduced to parody and political theater.

We may have averted catastrophe, but it doesn't mean there was not a real cost to America. We should commit to never again allow such political hostage taking. Instead, lay the foundation for using the clear language of the 14th Amendment to avoid the debt ceiling altogether.

We should collect billions of dollars already payable from some of the wealthiest individuals and corporations. It would be a strong signal about the fairness of our tax system.

It is ironic that Republicans are worried about pressing rich people for taxes they already owe, but would subject poor people to more harassment and meaningless paperwork.

We should instead concentrate on changing policies to reduce the deficit. If there will be time limits on benefits, maybe we could start with 20,000 rich farmers who got a million dollars a year or more for 37 consecutive years.

If we act in good faith, it shouldn't be so hard, and America will be the better.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding and for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in years, this Congress is actually debating a bill that will reduce spending from one year to the next. Let me repeat that: reduce spending from one year to the next. That is not something you hear around this town often.

Usually, the debate is: How much more money will Washington spend?

In fact, if Republicans were not in the majority in this House, that is exactly the debate that would be going on, how much more to spend, how many more taxes to raise because that is what President Biden wanted at the outset of this debate on the debt ceiling.

Just for a little background, let's be clear what the debt ceiling is. The debt ceiling is the Nation's credit card. For the last 2 years, you saw out-of-control, reckless spending to the tune of trillions of dollars where President Biden and his allies racked up so much debt that they maxed out the Nation's credit card.

We are at this point to address that problem.

Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it make sense at the same time that we are addressing the problem that President Biden created with years of spending money that we don't have that we also have an honest discussion and start solving the problem that caused the Nation to max out the credit card? That is what this debate has been about for the last few months. Frankly, I think it is a debate that has been a long time coming in this Nation.

Over months of debate, while no one gets everything they want, I think it is important that we talk about the things that we got, that we talk about the things that the American people will get out of this bill that will help start turning the trajectory of our Nation's spending in Washington, finally putting our country back on a path where we can keep this debate going.

This is the first step. Let's make no mistake about it, this bill doesn't solve all the problems that have been created over years and decades, but it starts to finally turn the ship of state in the right direction. It starts with real savings, over \$2 trillion in actual spending cuts. That is in the bill.

Again, this is a very historic first step. It doesn't mean that is where we stop. It means that is where we start. You don't get the next round of trillions in spending cuts if you don't lock in the first \$2.1 trillion that is in this bill.

Now, something else we do is we actually go and reclaim for the taxpayers of America what has been identified as \$28 billion in slush funds floating around Washington, all under the name of COVID. President Biden himself actually said COVID is over.

We passed legislation here in this House under this Republican majority to end the pandemic so we can get our country and our economy back going again. Yet, there is \$28 billion out there still unspent that liberals in Washington want to spend. If we don't pass this bill, they will spend that money in the name of COVID, even though COVID is over.

There is \$28 billion that should go back in savings to the taxpayer. Well, guess what is in this bill, Mr. Speaker? Those \$28 billion are reclaimed so the taxpayers get that money back. That is in this bill.

Let's talk about the IRS. In my years in public service on the State level or in Congress, I have never gotten a single call from a constituent going: Do you know what? The thing we really want you to do is go add more people to the IRS.

Yet, President Biden, for some reason, decided he wanted to more than double the size of the IRS. He wanted to go from about 80,000 people—to add not up to 87,000, but to add an additional 87,000 people. According to the Congressional Budget Office, they confirmed that it would break President Biden's promise.

You heard it over and over again that if you make less than \$400,000 a year, don't worry, you won't pay any more in new taxes. Well, maybe they are redefining what lower income means because if you are making less than \$100,000, according to the CBO, those new IRS agents will be going after lower income family workers and the single mom that is working two jobs at a restaurant. That is who they will be going after.

We step in and say no, we have to end that madness—over a billion dollars in cuts to the IRS to stop them from doing just that.

Let's talk about another big area of savings. A lot of people take out loans—a loan to buy their first home. I know that is harder to do under the Biden economy because interest rates are so high because of the out-of-control spending in Washington. This bill finally starts to address that so, hopefully, interest rates can go down. Hopefully, families can afford to buy their first home again.

There is something else that people do. Usually, a first loan a lot of people take out is a student loan. I know I did when I was a student. I signed the document, and it helped me get through college. I also worked my way through college.

When I graduated, there was never a day where I thought somebody else, some single mom working two jobs, ought to pay that loan back instead of me. I paid those loans back, and most Americans have done that. About 13 percent of the American people take out student loans.

Yet, for some reason, the President decided that he thinks all Americans, 100 percent of American taxpayers, should pay the student loans of the 13 percent that don't want to pay them back. Is that fair? Does anybody think that is fair to all of those people who are working hard and barely getting by in a tough economy?

What we do is we actually start those loan payments back. That is \$60 billion in savings just this year, in the first year, so that people don't have to carry the burden for something that somebody else said they would do.

□ 2015

This is America. We make our choices. If you want to take out a loan, you should have that ability, but you

shouldn't expect somebody else to go pay it for you. Let's get back to the values that made this country so great.

We put real permitting reforms in place, something we haven't seen in decades. Anybody that is trying to build anything in America, if you are trying to build a factory, if you are trying to maybe add on to your farm, if you have got a barn and you want to add on to it, they find a puddle in the back and under Waters of the U.S., next thing you know, you have got five different Federal agencies where groups are suing to stop you from getting that permit, even though you have done everything right. You followed all the rules.

We finally fixed that. We created a one-stop-shop so that if you are trying to get a permit, if you are playing by the rules, somebody else can't go game the system to try to kill your project by going to one agency and you spend 2 years fighting that lawsuit, you win that one. The next day they file another lawsuit with another agency and another and another, and next thing you know, it is 10 years later, and you just give up and walk away. It happens all the time in America.

We will have a one-stop-shop, but we also put shot clocks on the unelected bureaucrats because, you know what, Mr. Speaker, if a Federal agency tells you that you have to get them some information back, they don't say, hey, get it to us whenever you want to. They give you a deadline and it is usually pretty soon, and if you don't meet that deadline, you don't get your permit.

But if you get them all the information, you might wait 6 months, a year, or longer to hear back from the Federal agency. These are people that work for the taxpayers of America. Shouldn't they have the same requirements and a shot clock on them that they put on you, the American people paying their salaries? That is in this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, real work requirements. I don't think there has ever been a time in America where there are more jobs that are open, people looking for workers. You can go to a restaurant, if you want to take your family out for a nice dinner, and you will see a third of the tables empty, yet they are not seating anybody because they don't have enough workers.

Why is that? Because the Federal Government is paying millions of people right now not to work. Think about that.

In America, where everybody is looking for workers, the Federal Government is borrowing money from countries like China to pay people not to work. This is insanity.

For all the people out there that are working, they are paying that freight. Why don't we say, for people who are able-bodied, who are able to get back into the workforce—there is a social safety net for people who run on hard times. If you just choose to sit at home

and turn down jobs, that is your prerogative as an American. Just don't ask someone who is working two jobs to pay for you to sit at home and turn down work.

By putting work requirements back in place, something Joe Biden himself voted for as a Senator, you also strengthen Social Security and Medicare, two programs that are going bust under President Biden's runaway spending that we shored up in this bill, actually strengthening those programs that are so important to the people who paid into it.

There is more work to be done, absolutely, and we will get to work tomorrow working on the next round of things we need to do to keep getting this country back on track, but we never get there if we don't start with the first step.

That is what we are doing here tonight. That is why we need to get this bill passed, and then go to work on the next reforms we have got to do to continue strengthening this great Nation, the United States of America. I urge passage.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader failed to mention that we raised the national debt three times during Donald Trump's Presidency. He failed to point out that \$8.7 trillion was added to the national debt during Donald Trump's Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a productive member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the only problem is our tax system is broken, and you don't want to talk about it. We made strides to fix this problem with a historic IRS investment.

The IRS is coming after you. I saw those commercials. You are better than that, guys and gals. You are better than that. No one's putting an arm together, but we want to make sure everybody pays their fair share.

What in God's name is wrong with that?

That is what we are talking about. If you look at the IRS estimates of those people who are getting away with murder, that is what the average American knows about, thinks about, but does little talking about because he figures he can't do anything about it. You can.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. So, Article I is ignored many times by both parties, both sides of the aisle. It is the Congress that has the power to put a budget together. It is pretty simple.

All Americans must understand what is happening here. President Biden put forward a budget to boost opportunity for working Americans, increase access to healthcare, and improve tax fairness.

Mr. Speaker, in the greatest country in the world, if we don't fix our tax system, we have not done our job as Congress, folks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Democrats often say that the new IRS funding will only be used to go after the wealthy. This is simply not the case.

I include in the RECORD a CBO blog post from 2021 examining the Biden administration's \$80 billion proposal and stating that it would return the audit rates to the levels of about 10 years ago, and that that rate would rise for all taxpayers. Our calculations show that this would mean 600,000 more audits per year for taxpayers making less than \$75,000 a year.

[From CBO Blog, Sept. 2, 2021]

THE EFFECTS OF INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE IRS

(By Phill Swagel)

Last month, the Congressional Budget Office published An Analysis of Certain Proposals in the President's 2022 Budget. Since then, CBO has completed its analysis of another proposal in the President's budget, an increase in spending for the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS's) enforcement activities. CBO estimates that portions of the Administration's proposal to increase funding for the IRS by \$80 billion over the 2022–2031 period would increase revenues by approximately \$200 billion over those 10 years. That estimate does not include changes in revenues resulting from portions of the proposal that involve new information-reporting requirements and other changes to the tax code; those changes are estimated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

THE PROPOSAL

The Administration proposes funding for the IRS that is \$80 billion greater over 10 years than the amounts in CBO's July 2021 baseline projections (which reflect the assumption that current laws generally do not change). Two types of funding would be provided: discretionary appropriations, which would mainly be used for enforcement activities; and mandatory funding, which would be used for a variety of activities (not only enforcement but also operations support, business-systems modernization, and taxpayer services).

Spending would increase in each year between 2021 and 2031, though the highest growth would occur in the first few years. By 2031, CBO projects, the proposal would make the IRS's budget more than 90 percent larger than it is in CBO's July 2021 baseline projections and would more than double the IRS's staffing. Of the \$80 billion, CBO estimates, about \$60 billion would be for enforcement and related operations support.

The Administration also proposes that financial institutions increase their reporting about account inflows and outflows. Part of the increased funding would support the implementation of a new information-reporting system to be used by those institutions. The resulting effects on revenues are estimated by JCT and are not included in CBO's estimate of an approximately \$200 billion increase.

HOW CBO ESTIMATES THE EFFECT ON REVENUES OF INCREASED IRS FUNDING

CBO's estimate of revenues is based on the IRS's projected returns on investment (ROIs)

for spending on new enforcement initiatives. The IRS estimates those ROIs by calculating the expected revenues that would be raised from taxes, interest, and penalties as a result of the new initiatives and dividing them by their additional cost. (The agency has provided ROIs over the past five years as part of its budget justification.) The IRS's ROIs ramp up over three years as staff become trained and fully productive, arrive at the peak level, and then stay there. In recent years, peak ROIs have ranged from 5 to 9. That is, a \$1 increase in spending on the IRS's enforcement activities results in \$5 to \$9 of increased revenues.

CBO adjusts the ROIs so that they better reflect the marginal return on additional spending. First, CBO expects the IRS to prioritize the enforcement activities that it thinks will have the highest average return; additional enforcement spending would therefore have lower returns than previous spending. Second, CBO expects taxpayers to adapt to the IRS's enforcement activities and adopt new ways of evading detection, so an enforcement activity may have a lower return in later years. Finally, the productivity of the IRS's enforcement activities will also depend on the IRS's other capabilities. For example, modernized information technology that stored all of a taxpayer's information in digital form could increase the productivity of examiners (the employees who detect taxpayers' noncompliance).

CBO's estimate of revenues also accounts for the timing of collections resulting from enforcement activity by new hires. Taxes are assessed at the end of an audit; if taxpayers disagree with the assessment, they can appeal and continue to litigate. The length of each step depends on the complexity of the case. CBO estimates that an audit of medium complexity would take 24 months to complete. That time, combined with the expected training time for an experienced new hire, suggests that the IRS would begin to collect revenues 30 months after the new hire joined the agency. (The timing would be longer when cases were more complex or when the taxpayer did not agree to the assessment and appealed.)

What is Incorporated Into CBO's Estimate. CBO's estimate of the change in revenues is relative to the amount of revenues collected under current law (which is reflected in CBO's baseline budget projections). Under guidelines agreed to by the legislative and executive branches, this change in revenues typically would not be included in a cost estimate for legislation that brought about the change, but it would be reflected in CBO's baseline budget projections once the legislation was enacted.

CBO's estimate reflects the assumption that the proposed increase in funding would follow the proposed expansion of information reporting. Expanded information reporting might allow the IRS to better target potentially noncompliant taxpayers; it might also prompt taxpayers to file more accurate tax returns. It might have a positive effect on revenues collected, but it might also reduce the ROIs from enforcement activities, because if returns are more accurate, there will be less noncompliance to audit. In CBO's and JCT's judgment, those effects roughly offset each other, on net, resulting in a small positive effect on ROIs.

CBO's estimate includes "direct revenues" and "protected revenues." Direct revenues are generated from the IRS's auditing and collection efforts. Protected revenues result when the IRS prevents a taxpayer from recouping previously assessed and paid taxes—for example, when the IRS prevents fraudulent refunds or disallows claims in taxpayers' amended returns.

The estimate reflects CBO's expectation that the increased enforcement activities

would change the voluntary compliance rate—that is, the share of taxes owed that are paid voluntarily and on time—only modestly. The magnitude of that effect is highly uncertain, however, and the empirical evidence about the effects of audits on taxpayers' behavior is inconclusive. Research about such deterrence finds varying responses, depending on the type of taxpayer. People generally increase their reported income in the years following an audit, but people with higher income generally do not, and neither do corporations. (For more discussion, see Box 1 in CBO's July 2020 report Trends in the Internal Revenue Service's Funding and Enforcement.)

How the Current Analysis Differs From Previous Analyses. In that July 2020 report, CBO estimated that a \$40 billion increase in enforcement funding would raise \$103 billion (for a net effect of \$63 billion). The methods used for this estimate differ in several ways from the methods used for that one.

First, CBO used updated ROIs that incorporated the IRS's most recent estimates of the return on enforcement activities. CBO then adjusted the ROIs to reflect both direct revenues and protected revenues, increasing the peak ROI from 6.4 to 7.1.

Second, CBO's current methods allow for positive interaction between enforcement spending and other IRS funding. That is, CBO accounts for ways in which increased capabilities, such as more digitization of taxpayers' information and greater visibility of income flows, can increase the productivity of enforcement activities.

Third, this analysis reflects a longer time frame for receiving enforcement revenues because of the complexity of audits associated with high-wealth individuals, large corporations, and partnerships. Taxpayers with greater resources may be more likely to appeal assessments or to litigate their disputes in the U.S. Tax Court, delaying the receipt of assessed taxes. As a result, revenues from some audits will not be received until later than CBO estimated in its July 2020 analysis.

Sources of Uncertainty. The change in revenues resulting from an increase in the IRS's funding could be different from CBO's estimate. It depends on the IRS's ability to hire experienced candidates, changes in voluntary compliance, and the interaction of enforcement funding with the IRS's other capabilities.

The IRS intends to hire mid- and senior-level people with private-sector experience who will not require a great deal of training to become productive. But it might not be able to hire its desired mix of candidates. If it hired less experienced candidates, it would have to spend more resources training them. Not only would they take longer to become productive, but current staff members would have to devote more time to training them. A related source of uncertainty in CBO's estimate is attrition: if it proved higher than expected, personnel would have fewer years at full productivity.

An increase in the IRS's funding could signal that the agency was more capable of detecting noncompliance, thus increasing voluntary compliance and revenues. However, if there were fewer noncompliant taxpayers to audit, the ROIs from the IRS's enforcement activities would drop, and the direct revenues from increased enforcement would be lower than CBO estimated.

Finally, it is unclear how much the greater information reporting or the increased IRS spending in areas other than enforcement (such as technology) could improve examiners' productivity. Greater nonenforcement spending might increase overall revenues but decrease ROIs—for example, if improved services for taxpayers enabled those taxpayers to more accurately determine their

tax liability, reducing the pool of noncompliant taxpayers to audit.

EFFECTS ON TAXPAYERS

The proposed increase in spending on the IRS's enforcement activities would result in higher audit rates than those underlying CBO's baseline budget projections. Between 2010 and 2018, the audit rate for higher-income taxpayers fell, while the audit rate for lower-income taxpayers remained fairly stable. In CBO's baseline projections, the overall audit rate declines, resulting in lower audit rates for both higher-income and lower-income taxpayers. The proposal, by contrast, would return audit rates to the levels of about 10 years ago; the rate would rise for all taxpayers, but higher-income taxpayers would face the largest increase. In addition, the Administration's policies would focus additional IRS resources on enforcement activity aimed at high-wealth taxpayers, large corporations, and partnerships. CBO estimates that if the proposals were enacted, tax compliance would be improved, and more households would meet their obligation under the law.

Higher audit rates would probably also result in some audits of taxpayers who would later be determined not to owe additional taxes. However, the Administration's proposal for more information reporting, as well as additional spending on IRS technology, might reduce the burden on compliant taxpayers by allowing the IRS to better target noncompliant ones and to reduce the number of audits that resulted in no change in tax assessment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I come from a town called Butler, Pennsylvania, and in that area, it is Pennsylvania's 16th Congressional District. In that district, the average annual income for a family of four is about \$52,000.

Now, down here people laugh and say nobody can live on \$52,000 a year. I said, in my district they do. In my district they do.

But let's talk about this in kitchen-table economics. Last year, we had about \$4.9 trillion in revenue. We spent \$6.22 trillion.

Kitchen-table economics is that you tell that family that earned \$49,000, go out and spend \$62,000, and they look at you like there is something wrong with your head. They say, you can't do that. I said, your government does. Your government does. They do it every year, and they do it with your tax dollars.

Listen, this is America's wake-up call. This isn't about the blue side of the House or the red side of the House. Look up in the gallery. That is red, white, and blue. That is America. Those are the people that pay our taxes.

All we are asking tonight is we look at the Fiscal Responsibility Act. What a weird name to be used in Washington. I wish we could stop playing this game of who struck John. Both parties have spent too much money for far too long.

Tonight is the night to turn this ship around. This is the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, and it takes more than one person at the wheel. We have all got to grab

that wheel, and we have got to start pulling on that wheel to turn this ship around.

Tonight is a wake-up call, America. It is not a Republican wake-up call or a Democrat wake-up call, but it is an American wake-up call. Please, wake up.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Biden, Leader JEFFRIES, and all of our negotiators for the great work they have done to keep us from defaulting on our debts.

This agreement protects critical funding for children and families. I am especially pleased with the protections for homeless youth in school, foster children who have aged out of care, and veterans in need of health services. It protects Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

This bill protects historic investments in clean energy. It also protects the 40 million student loan borrowers under President Biden's student loan relief plan, and it provides relief for some of my concerns about SNAP and work benefits and work requirements in TANF.

I still have some serious concerns about how it affects the environment and responds to climate control issues. The bill is not everything I wanted, but it does give us an opportunity to pay our debt and protect the good work we have done during the first term of President Biden.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), the Budget chairman.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as I have repeatedly warned, the fiscal state of our Nation is in decline. Our financial health is rapidly deteriorating, and our national debt is unsustainable, and, by the way, both parties bear some blame.

One thing is for sure, Mr. Speaker. We didn't get here overnight, and we won't get out of this mess with just one piece of legislation.

Here is my admonition to my colleagues. This can't just be a one-off deal. It must be the beginning of a movement to restore fiscal sanity in our Nation's Capitol. We must end the era of Big Government funded on the backs of our children and change the culture in Washington to continuously and repeatedly rein in our out-of-control deficit spending.

Today, there is only one deal on the table, and only one question for me and my colleagues to answer: Do the biggest cuts to the wasteful and bloated bureaucracy, record rescissions of Federal funds and reforms to welfare and environmental regulations constitute a meaningful step in the right direction?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is unequivocally, yes. As I have said all along, we will pay our bills. We will protect the good faith and credit of the United

States, but we will not give politicians a blank check to bankrupt our country.

The American people gave Republicans the majority in the House to stop our Democratic colleagues' unbridled spending and reverse Biden's failed economic policies, and I believe the Fiscal Responsibility Act is certainly a good start, which is why I support this piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), a very capable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan budget agreement in order to protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, while also preventing a devastating default on our debt.

To be clear, this bill is far from perfect, but it prevents a default, it prevents future efforts to hold this Nation hostage for the rest of the 118th Congress, and it prevents cruel Republican cuts.

This budget agreement that President Biden negotiated protects funding for education, healthcare, veterans' benefits, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Most importantly, it prevents Republicans from forcing a devastating default that would kill countless jobs in my district and destroy our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my frustration with the crisis that my Republican colleagues have manufactured. The American people deserve better than a Republican majority that chooses to govern crisis by crisis. Let's lift this debt ceiling and get on with the people's business in the people's House.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

□ 2030

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Responsibility Act. How could I not support a bill that claws back billions in unspent COVID funds, a bill that cuts trillions in Biden's out-of-control spending, a bill that caps spending levels for years to come, and a bill that enacts work requirements to bring more Americans back into the workforce, lift households out of poverty by connecting them with the best antipoverty program—a good job. Most importantly, this bill is the beginning. It is a start to put our Nation on a better fiscal trajectory.

Our debt-to-GDP today is at the highest level ever since the end of World War II. If we do nothing to curb spending, our Federal debt will be double our GDP by 2050. This is a start to change our trajectory.

Now, I wish I could be voting for more than this. I liked our original bill a heck of a lot better, but the fact is, the President and the Democrats who

control the Senate fought hard to maintain their spending addiction.

Given that we only control the House, I am very pleased with all that is in this bill. It is most definitely an improvement over existing law, and I am disappointed that some of my colleagues don't see that.

This bill will give our creditors the confidence that we can govern by putting us on a better path.

It is a step in the right direction, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, there isn't anybody in this Chamber who believes that Republicans will abide by a cap on defense spending in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a champion of the child tax credit.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement. This deal will protect American families and our economy from a devastating default on our Nation's bills in just 5 days. It will also shield our veterans, seniors, law enforcement, and schools from the worst of the extreme demands my Republican colleagues issued while holding our economy hostage.

This deal is far from perfect, but we can't allow perfect to be the enemy of the good when the stakes are this high. A default would mean an immediate recession, millions of jobs lost, devastated retirement accounts, and higher borrowing costs for Americans.

Compromise means that no one gets everything they want, so we have a choice between a catastrophic outcome or a chance to move forward with a bipartisan compromise. The worst outcome here would be a default.

Mr. Speaker, let's get this done and over to the Senate so we can take default off the table.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, the Rolling Stones said, "You can't always get what you want . . . you get what you need," and we need to avert a default that would stop checks to our seniors, benefits for our veterans, hurt the U.S. dollar, and Americans' retirement savings. We also need to change the fiscal trajectory of our Nation.

This bill does both by reducing inflationary spending for the first time in over a decade with the largest savings in history, imposing spending caps, and adding checks and balances on the executive branch.

We started from a place where the President and the Senate refused to negotiate, and we ended with conservative wins that include stopping Biden's plan to hire additional IRS agents this year, clawing back unused COVID funds, expanding work requirements to reduce dependency on public benefits, and cutting costly red tape that slows down critical infrastructure projects.

While no deal is perfect, this is only the beginning, and we cannot allow

perfect to be the enemy of the good. Republicans, under the leadership of Speaker MCCARTHY, have restored balance to government. We put an end to the Democrats' massive inflationary spending sprees, and we will continue to fight for the American taxpayers as we proceed in this process to stop reckless policies that fuel inflation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a very capable woman and member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Republicans claim they just had to threaten the economic well-being of every American man, woman, and child because the \$31 trillion debt was too high.

Well, hypocrisy, thou hast a name, GOP. Because what they insisted on, their red line was not financial at all; it was to double down on the so-called "work requirements." Thank God the White House negotiations pushed back on the worst of these changes in TANF that would have saved \$6 million over 10 years.

Speaker after speaker has insisted on denying food to poor, old women who are primarily Black and Brown. It seems like the pound of flesh that you get is more delicious than having savings, but just wait. Before the ink is dry on this bill, you will be pushing for \$3.5 trillion in business tax cuts. Hear my words. You heard it here first.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while the Fiscal Responsibility Act is not perfect and God knows we need serious corrections, but there are at least ten conservative American provisions in this bill that will benefit our economy and advance a higher level of fiscal responsibility.

Let's be honest, this is the most conservative bill that can pass with a Biden White House and a Schumer Senate. The Fiscal Responsibility Act stops the excessive spending, stops the bleeding, and adds to our workforce with work requirements. It includes the most important Federal and environmental permitting reforms in 40 years.

Don't take my word for it. This is coming from the Associated General Contractors of America, the American Petroleum Institute, the Marcellus Shale Coalition, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Virtually every small business association, every group committed to sound, fiscal policy, such as Americans for Tax Reform and Americans for Prosperity have endorsed this legislation. This bill reins in the Biden administration's executive order spending which accounted for over \$1 trillion in spending over the last 2 years.

There is also a reduction of the IRS for \$20 billion, it protects Social Security, and all the while we will avoid a

catastrophic default. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), whose voice and health have been returned.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, paying America's bills isn't an option. Defaulting on our debt would have a consequence for every single American and, in fact, would have global consequences. It would increase every families' costs. It would eliminate millions of jobs, and threaten the retirement security of seniors and families all across this country.

Let me be clear: We shouldn't be in this position. We shouldn't be close to default. It is a manufactured crisis. The House Republican majority created this crisis because they didn't have the will to submit their ideas to the legislative process, rather holding us all hostage to exact this price, to exact this legislation when we could have simply gone through the legislative process of making decisions about the priorities for this country.

They have the majority on the Appropriations Committee, on the Ways and Means Committee, and on the Budget Committee. They ought not fear the argument over these issues. We need to make sure that we accept the fact that we have come to a compromise to protect Medicare and Medicaid. It protects the American people from catastrophic default. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3746.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in my 15 years in Congress that I have voted to increase the debt limit. I do so today because this measure places real constraints on future spending, more than \$2 trillion. That makes this bill the most important victory for fiscal conservatism in more than a decade.

The debt is but a symptom of the central problem—reckless spending. Once we have spent a dollar, there are only three ways to pay for it: Taxes, inflation, or debt. It is the spending, stupid.

We have got a long way to go, but until the American people have had enough and replace the President and the Senate majority, this is a remarkable step forward. The many progrowth provisions in the bill provide the most potent antidote to debt—economic expansion.

Mr. Speaker, defeating this bill would create a financial and political panic that will quickly forfeit the many hard-won reforms that are in this bill. We cannot let that happen.

Mr. NEAL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this imperfect bill.

Mr. Speaker, look, I would have much rather voted for a clean debt limit increase as we did three times under the previous President. I do believe it is profoundly wrong that Republicans chose to hold our economy hostage, using the American people as leverage to demand concessions, and it was unnecessary.

We are in a divided House. They have all the leverage they need to negotiate this through the regular appropriations process.

Our values sometimes overlap, but they don't here when they want to protect the wealthiest tax cheats and we just want everyone to pay their fair share.

Look, President Biden and his negotiating team worked skillfully and successfully to prevent a majority of the draconian tax cuts. This bill could have been so much worse, but it would be a catastrophe if we didn't pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "yes," and I continue to urge my colleagues to permanently abolish the debt ceiling, which could cause a real disaster someday soon if we don't get rid of it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for the Fiscal Responsibility Act. As I have said from the very beginning, we must negotiate, we must cut spending, and we cannot default.

The FRA reduces discretionary spending for the first time in decades, and it is the largest deficit reduction in our Nation's history. It cuts non-defense and nonveteran spending to below 2022 levels, one of the primary goals of the Limit, Save, Grow Act.

It saves taxpayers \$2.1 trillion over the next 6 years while blocking \$5 trillion in new taxes proposed by the Biden administration. The bill also caps spending at 1 percent growth over the next 6 years and through the appropriations process, House Republicans will have the opportunity to reduce spending even more.

That will help us take on the Biden administration's reckless spending head on, crack down on record inflation, and get our economy on the right track. This bill also protects Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits, despite previous false claims by my Democratic colleagues that we were going to cut those vital programs.

It enacts critical permitting and NEPA reform, enacts safeguards on executive spending, and forces Congress to engage in a functional appropriations process.

The bottom line is this: With a divided government, no party is going to get 100 percent of what it wants. We all have a responsibility to govern, and default is not an option.

The Fiscal Responsibility Act puts us on the path to fiscal sanity, protects our commitment to veterans and seniors, and raises the debt ceiling so we will not default. This is a bill we

should all support, and I will vote "aye."

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is far from perfect; however, the full faith and credit of the United States is at risk, and we cannot let Republicans drive us to default.

Defaulting on the national debt would disrupt Social Security benefits for 92,000 households in my congressional district. I will not stand by and let harm come to our Nation, seniors, and disabled people. I urge my colleagues not to draw out this debt crisis and instead return to our focus of lowering the costs for working families.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTHRIE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining.

□ 2045

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), another very capable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan budget agreement and President Biden's work to ensure the Nation pays our bills and avoids a catastrophic, self-inflicted economic crisis.

This legislation protects the many bipartisan achievements realized in the last Congress, such as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, CHIPS and Science Act, PACT Act, as well as the Inflation Reduction Act with its historic investments in addressing climate change.

With this vote, we will protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid and prevent devastating cuts sought to life-sustaining SNAP and TANF programs. With this vote, we will keep America moving forward to meet the challenges ahead of us.

Compromise requires give-and-take, and both sides made difficult concessions to achieve this agreement. This is the result of bipartisan dealmaking, and I look forward to holding up the President's side of this bargain.

I hope this is a learning moment, and we can avoid future political brinkmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to put the American people over politics and support this important bill.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), a very capable member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I support the bipartisan budget agreement to raise the debt ceiling because if we

don't, we will devastate the global markets and undermine the faith of the world's most important financial system, the United States of America.

I support a clean raising of the debt ceiling, but elections have consequences. My colleagues on the other side wanted to use their leverage for concessions. In a divided government, governing means compromise, and it gets us this bill, legislation that would: one, raise the debt ceiling until 2025; two, stop the drastic cuts desired by the Republicans and protect Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Although it limits SNAP for certain ages, it expands those types of benefits for veterans and our homeless.

Finally, we protect the historic legislation we passed last Congress to invest in our infrastructure and manufacturing, reduce drug costs, and care for veterans. Part of this bill even furthers our transition to clean energy.

I will vote for this bill, but we have a lot more to do if we want to get serious about reducing our debt and deficit. That only begins when we stop governing by crisis and start governing by leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my district, the most important energy district in the country, on behalf of American energy independence, and on behalf of all Americans who are searching for a reasonable solution to a looming crisis.

There are approximately, right now, 229 major fossil fuel projects in the United States currently awaiting permit approval. A recent study found that \$157 billion in energy investment was stuck in the NEPA pipeline and that simply a 2-year NEPA deadline would spur \$67 billion in energy investment. Killing energy projects by the bureaucratic red tape nightmare and the slow-walking that we have seen is unacceptable. No more.

I am extremely proud of the energy reforms, the NEPA reforms, and the EPA reforms in this bill, the first in over 40 years, which will speed up over 200 projects to lower costs for consumers and protect our national security.

No, this bill is not perfect, and arguably, it shouldn't be. A divided government yields compromise and slows the heavy hand of government, but saving \$2 trillion, lifting families out of poverty, and defunding IRS agents is worth it. Vote "yes" for America's energy independence.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), an alum of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, Democrats' leadership has protected our hard-earned and historic economic recovery. That team secured an agreement that prevents Republicans from forcing devastating default and rejects their most extreme cuts in the GOP default on America bill. President

Biden's agreement protected Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans' healthcare.

This was a negotiation with individuals whose top priority was cutting food assistance and protecting the wealthy. That was their main priority across the entire negotiation.

Fiscal responsibility? Their only responsibility was to protect their tax cuts for the ultrawealthy that grew the debt by \$7 trillion in the first place.

The President successfully insisted that if this agreement was going to include time limits on SNAP, it needed to include meaningful improvements to SNAP.

Republicans protected the wealthy at the feet of the neediest Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. PLASKETT. Democrats understand the needs of the American people and our most vulnerable Americans, as well as the full faith and credit of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that because of the Republican Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the bottom 20 percent of earners saw their average Federal tax rate fall to its lowest level in 40 years. Low- and middle-income families of four saved at least \$2,000 on their tax bill each year.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a most historic night.

First of all, I thank President Biden. President Biden invited me, along with the other leaders, ranking member, and chairman of our Agriculture Committee. It gave me a chance to talk straight to the President about the serious food shortage that is coming to our veterans.

Many of you may not know this, but the veterans are living in more food-insecure households than anybody else—7.4 percent higher than the general public. When I told President Biden that, he said that we have to do something about it. That is when he moved, with his energy, to be able to take not only the veterans but others off of SNAP work requirements.

God bless this President for his leadership.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN).

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress to solve problems, and this legislation averts a crisis. A default would jeopardize millions of people with unemployment, increase interest rates, and put retirees at risk and devastate their 401(k)'s.

A default would also jeopardize numerous investments in the American

worker in the 117th Congress, including the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. That bill not only created jobs but also, with a strong "buy American" provision, strengthened our domestic steel and manufacturing base and also allows for our veterans to be protected and provides funds dedicated to the health benefits and resources for the toxic exposures fund.

I appreciate the dedicated work of the administration and my Democratic colleagues.

For my neighbor Gretchen, who had anxiety about her 401(k), this bill supports the American worker. It supports American industry, the steel industry, and it also protects the American Dream. I am voting "yes."

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this has been an elevating conversation about how we arrived here tonight. Our colleagues on the other side voted for the infrastructure bill, voted for the CHIPS Act, voted for the CARES Act, voted for the defense spending increases, and they voted for a tax cut in 2017 that borrowed \$2.3 trillion that was added to the national debt.

Now, for those who might be paying attention tonight, the national debt is the cumulative effect of deficits. These were annual deficits that were run up.

Neither party is responsible for the pandemic. On March 11, 2020, we were warned what was coming. Twenty million jobs evaporated. Tonight, in some measure because of the leadership of Joe Biden, every one of those jobs has been returned and 9½ million jobs go unanswered.

In this negotiation, which means you don't get everything you want, there are some quality moments that we take great credit for. We defended Social Security despite the fact that there were three Republican Senators who proposed cuts to Social Security. That is the reality. We defended Medicare. We defended Medicaid. We defended veterans benefits. We are very proud of the fact that we wrote the pandemic relief act.

There is a group here tonight—I have been here long enough to know this—that was against this before they were against it. They were against it years ago, never mind tonight—this moment of bringing the Nation to default, what it would do to the American dollar as the currency of choice for the world, what this would do in treasury markets for liquidity purposes, what this would do to the hard-earned 401(k) plans of the American family, to take us to this moment, this showdown that we had.

This argument tonight was never about perfection. All 435 Members of this House would probably have written a different version of this bill. In a

divided government, that is not reality.

The last point I want to make is this: In the coming days, after this righteous debate about balancing the budget, our Republican colleagues are about to offer a massive tax cut. We need to be ready because of the fiscal rectitude that they have offered on this floor tonight. The corresponding responsibility of all of us is to point out what they intend to do with another tax cut—2001, \$1.3 trillion, and by the way, with two wars and 2 million more veterans that we need to support.

The other reality is that back in 2003 was another trillion dollars of tax cuts. The worst one of all was that tax cut in December 2017, where they borrowed \$2.3 trillion for a tax cut that went to the wealthiest among us and had very meager economic growth.

□ 2100

This debate tonight was a good and spirited one because we also, I think, have found a common purpose in passing this legislation.

Let's engage in this debate going forward. If we want the things that we say they want, then we are going to have to pay for them. That means, at some point, revisiting these tax cuts that have been put on the table in an arbitrary fashion and, as I noted, with borrowed money.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the other side of the aisle over and over talk about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Let me tell you about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Mr. Speaker. Last year, we had record revenue into the United States of \$4.9 trillion, which was \$900-plus billion more than what the Joint Committee on Taxation and the CBO predicted would happen upon passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act delivered for a family of four who makes less than \$60,000 a year. They paid zero in Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about tax cuts. The other side passed something called the Inflation Reduction Act, and it was tax cuts for their wealthy donors. In fact, the CBO just came out with a new score saying that it cost over \$700 billion.

Guess what? Ninety percent of your tax credits go to corporations with more than \$1 billion in revenues, and \$125 billion goes to China. That is what your tax cuts did.

After years of Washington running in the wrong direction, we have an opportunity to take meaningful steps in the right direction on addressing America's debt crisis.

The American people deserve nothing less. They see what inflation, caused by reckless spending of the Democratic Party, has done to their family budgets, to their retirement security, and to their small business plan.

We have the opportunity to end the constant doling out of tax dollars under the guise of COVID relief.

We have the opportunity to downsize the \$80 billion pay raise that was given to the IRS last year. The IRS does not need a raise. It needs a reckoning.

We have the opportunity to support those who can work to find work and climb out of poverty.

We have the opportunity to put some guardrails on the administration, so if they are going to spend tax dollars by executive fiat, then they have to find savings somewhere else.

We have the opportunity and the responsibility to address our debt crisis as we address the debt ceiling.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill to prevent a catastrophic default, which would jack up interest rates, eliminate 700,000 jobs, raise mortgage rates to over 8 percent, cut housing vouchers, and hurt small businesses and consumers.

All of this, because Republicans, who added \$6.7 trillion to the debt under twice-impeached former President Trump.

Republicans claim they care about debt reduction.

But their leader, former President Trump said, “I’m the king of debt. I’m great with debt. Nobody knows debt better than me.” He said this to Norah O’Donnell in an interview on CBS.

Very recently, Trump said, “I say to the Republicans out there—Congressmen, Senators—if they don’t give you massive cuts, you’re going to have to do a default.”

Democrats support this bill because we refuse to allow our country to default on its debt.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

This bill is not perfect. Some will say that it is not even good. But I say it is better than the extortion bill pushed through this House last month by this Republican majority that would have forced Congress to either default on paying our nation’s bills or make devastating cuts that would hurt the health, safety, and wellbeing of the American people.

This bill prevents a default that would trigger an economic catastrophe, a global market panic, and a job killing recession.

The most egregious cuts that the Republicans originally proposed last month in their Default on America Act will be avoided.

Cuts that were originally proposed to the Toxic Exposure Fund created by the bipartisan PACT Act have been reversed as have the reductions in veterans’ health care and benefits.

I have been very concerned about the cuts to rural development programs, nutrition for women and children, and funding for economically distressed farmers which have been reduced.

We must pay our debts and debate issues of spending and revenue through regular order and not under threat of default.

No, this bill is not perfect. And to many it may not be good. But it is a better way forward than the chaos and consequences of a

first ever default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Section 321 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA) employs the term “reasonably foreseeable” in four instances. The intent of using the term “reasonably foreseeable” in subsection (a) of section 321, which amends section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act, is to narrow the scope of NEPA’s requirements. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare “a detailed statement . . . on the environmental impact” of any proposed federal project “significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(i). This detailed statement is colloquially known as an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). At present, NEPA requires that an EIS must include, inter alia, a detailed statement on “the environmental impact of the proposed agency action” and “any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented[.]” 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(i) and (ii).

Ultimately, in amending NEPA to include the concept of reasonable foreseeability, Congress intends to establish in statute *Sierra Club v. Marsh*, 976 F.2d 763 (1st Cir. 1992). In *Sierra Club*, the court stated succinctly that “[n]ot all impacts need be discussed in exhaustive detail. First, only those effects that are ‘likely’ (or ‘foreseeable’ or ‘reasonably foreseeable’) need be discussed . . . and, as in other legal contexts, the terms ‘likely’ and ‘foreseeable,’ as applied to a type of environmental impact, are properly interpreted as meaning that the impact is sufficiently likely to occur that a person of ordinary prudence would take it into account in reaching a decision.” *Sierra Club* at 765 (internal citations omitted). Through use of the term “reasonably foreseeable” in section 321 of the FRA, Congress intends to narrow NEPA’s scope by establishing in statute the ordinary prudence standard with respect to NEPA analysis.

Section 321(a) of the FRA amends 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)(i) and (ii) with the intent to narrow the scope of what must be included in an EIS. Clause (i) is amended from “the environmental impact of the proposed action” to “reasonably foreseeable environmental effects of the proposed agency action”. The intent of this amendment is to narrow the scope from “any environmental impact”, which can be broadly construed, to only those “environmental effects” that would be a “reasonably foreseeable” result “of the proposed agency action.” In executing this amendment to NEPA, Congress seeks to clarify that an agency need not evaluate all effects of a proposed action, but rather only those effects that are “reasonably foreseeable.”

Clause (ii) is amended from “any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented” to “any reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented”. The intent of this amendment is to narrow the scope from “any adverse environmental effects”, which can be broadly construed, to only those adverse environmental effects that are also “reasonably foreseeable.” In each of these instances, it is Congress’s intent to enshrine in statute the ordinary prudence standard with respect to the content of an EIS.

Similarly, section 321(b) of the FRA also employs the term “reasonably foreseeable” in

establishing in statute levels of review under NEPA. By qualifying the “significant effect” with the term “reasonably foreseeable”, Congress again intends to employ the ordinary prudence standard to make clear the circumstances in which an agency must issue an EIS. Specifically, Congress intends to limit preparation of an EIS to only those instances where the significant effect on the quality of the human environment is also “reasonably foreseeable” as opposed to merely possible or any or all potential significant effects. The term “reasonably foreseeable” is again employed with respect to an “environmental assessment” for consistency and to provide clarity in the distinction between circumstances in which an EIS versus an environmental assessment is required.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak on H.R. 3746, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

It is important to highlight and discuss how we got here and what is at stake with this critical and momentous measure.

I know I am not alone in the disappointment at what steps have been taken to hold our nation’s economy hostage and put American lives at risk.

It is shameful that, while we have a bipartisan agreement here today, we have taken painful compromises to get here.

And although arduous efforts on both sides of the aisle allowed for us to move forward with this agreement, and some critical protections for the American people have been preserved—it must be stated that this agreement is not one that entirely reflects what we in Congress should be united on—namely, our most basic and fundamental truths that hold us together as a democracy.

We are nation that upholds the ability for all to prosper, as well as one that upholds the ability for all Americans to be protected and cared for in our times of greatest need.

It is important to understand that the foundations of a society do not extend only to its political and economic system; they must extend to its social and moral system as well.

Taking all of these in balance there is no other comparable governmental system that has raised the standard of living of millions of people, created vast new wealth and resources, or inspired so many beneficial innovations and technologies.

Governmental structures providing for protections and safety nets for all Americans is what makes us all successful as a nation united.

Creating and preserving such structure is the critical investment in our government, our nation, our security, and our development and growth for current and future generations to benefit from.

Yet, instead of investing in America, many of my Republican colleagues would rather focus on holding our economy hostage to advance unpopular and dangerous priorities.

Holding our nation’s debt ceiling as collateral to inflict painful cuts that will impact the lives of millions of Americans and knowing that breaching the debt limit would provoke unprecedented economic damage and instability in the U.S. and around the world is a sad state that we have found ourselves in.

Yes, it is evident that my Republican colleagues will not prioritize the wellbeing, safety, health, and prosperity of the American people when looking at what we have had to give up in this bill.

While much is unknown about the devastating impact this bill will have, we do know that some immediate changes will inevitably cause harm to many American families, children and vulnerable individuals.

That is why I offered several amendments during the Rules Committee that will make additional exemptions and elimination of disqualifications for several additional special populations in which we must protect and continue to support when they are in their most desperate and fragile times of need.

Ensuring that we are not taking critical resources and money for food away from children and families living in poverty is not only the right thing to do, but also the economically smart thing to do.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is the nation's most important and effective anti-hunger program.

Any changes in SNAP will have an incredible impact on millions of Americans and Texans.

As of 2020, there were 18.66 million households relying on SNAP and 7.11 million SNAP households with children.

Texas holds the second highest number of households using the SNAP program in 2023 at 1,167,720, making up 11.5 percent of Texas households.

As of April 2023, there were 284,794 SNAP cases and 615,463 eligible individuals in Harris County, my district's biggest county.

This included 92,214 individuals aged less than 5 and 228,519 individuals between the ages of 5 through 17.

My first amendment for H.R. 3746, listed on the Rules Committee roster as Amendment No. 56, would have added a provision to extend exemption regarding current work requirement exemptions in the Food and Nutrition Act for a parent or person responsible for dependent child up to age 24 in SNAP household.

In Texas, 79 percent of SNAP participants are families with children. That's more than the national rate of 69 percent of SNAP participants across the country being families with children.

Further, the SNAP participation rate in Texas for working poor people is 72 percent—which is also more than the national rate of 41 percent of SNAP participants nationwide being in working families.

We need to understand that parents continue to support children beyond the age of adolescence impacting financial resources for families well into a child's early twenties.

Across the country there 5.134 million, and 528,000 in Texas aged 18 through 24 in poverty as of 2021.

Nearly 1 in 3 parents (31 percent) have made a significant financial sacrifice to help their adult children financially.

Over two-thirds (68 percent) of parents of adult children have made or are currently making a financial sacrifice to help their kids financially.

Parents say they sacrificed retirement savings (43 percent), emergency savings (51 percent), paying down their own debt (49 percent) or reaching a financial milestone (55 percent).

Over 40 percent of American children rely primarily on their mothers' earnings for financial support in crosssectional surveys.

In July 2022, half of adults ages 18 to 29 were living with one or both of their parents.

Significantly higher than the share who were living with their parents in 2010 (44 percent on

average that year) or 2000 (38 percent on average).

What this means is that we need to understand that support for families with dependent children under the age of 24 and who are living in poverty need to be protected and extended the grace of an exemption in this bill.

My second amendment for H.R. 3746, listed on the Rules Committee roster as Amendment No. 59, would have extended the former foster care exemption to all individuals 24 or younger under state custody and aging out of critical support services.

More than 23,000 children will age out of the US foster care system every year.

Every year in Texas, more than 1,200 young adults age out of the foster care system without being adopted.

Less than half of Texas foster care alumni (46.9 percent) were currently employed at least ten hours per week.

Only half of alumni (51.6 percent) reported having a household income that was greater than the poverty line.

By 24 years old, 50 percent of former foster kids had been "couch surfing" since leaving care.

One in ten interviewed alumni (11.1 percent) was currently incarcerated; nearly seven in ten males (68.0 percent) had been arrested since leaving care, 55.2 percent had been convicted of a crime, and 62.3 percent had spent at least one night incarcerated.

Over 90 percent of foster youth who move more than four times will end up in juvenile justice.

Many youth in the juvenile and criminal justice system are not deemed to be indigent but have also had contact with the foster care system and have been removed from their homes even if they have not been formerly adjudicated as a foster child.

Far too often children in state custody are taken from their homes for significant periods of times during their adolescence and at a time when they are most vulnerable to recidivating upon their return to their homes due to gaps and lack of resources to help them get jobs, education, mental health care, substance abuse and housing.

It is important that we continue to provide necessary resources for all children and youth aging out of state custody where they have been removed from their homes during critical times of development and growth—and often are left to survive on their own and/or cannot return to their homes upon their release.

We need to do more to support youth aging out of state custody.

Despite no Democratic common-sense amendments being accepted at this posture, we have no choice but to continue to move forward and still try to make a better way for our nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 456, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2797.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 314, noes 117, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—314

Adams	Dunn (FL)	Kim (NJ)
Aderholt	Edwards	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Ellzey	Kuster
Allen	Emmer	Kustoff
Allred	Escobar	LaLota
Amodei	Eshoo	LaMalfa
Armstrong	Estes	Lamborn
Arrington	Evans	Landsman
Auchincloss	Ezell	Langworthy
Babin	Feenstra	Larsen (WA)
Bacon	Ferguson	Latta
Baird	Fitzgerald	LaTurner
Balderson	Fitzpatrick	Lawler
Balint	Fleischmann	Lee (FL)
Barr	Fletcher	Lee (NV)
Bean (FL)	Flood	Leger Fernandez
Beatty	Foster	Letlow
Bentz	Foushee	Levin
Bera	Fox	Lieu
Bergman	Frankel, Lois	Lofgren
Beyer	Franklin, C.	Loudermilk
Bice	Scott	Lucas
Bilirakis	Frost	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (GA)	Gallagher	Lynch
Blumenauer	Gallego	Magaziner
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	Malliotakis
Boyle (PA)	Garbarino	Manning
Brown	Garcia, Mike	Massie
Brownley	Garcia, Robert	Matsui
Bucshon	Gimenez	McBath
Budzinski	Golden (ME)	McCarthy
Burgess	Gonzalez,	McCaul
Calvert	Vicente	McClain
Caraveo	Gottheimer	McClellan
Carbajal	Granger	McClintock
Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	McCollum
Carey	Graves (MO)	McGarvey
Carl	Green (TN)	McHenry
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	Meeks
Carter (GA)	Greene (GA)	Menendez
Carter (LA)	Grothman	Meuser
Cartwright	Guthrie	Mfume
Case	Harder (CA)	Miller (OH)
Casten	Higgins (NY)	Miller (WV)
Castor (FL)	Hill	Miller-Meeks
Chavez-DeRemer	Himes	Molinaro
Cherfilus-	Hinson	Moolenaar
McCormick	Horsford	Moore (UT)
Cicilline	Houchin	Morelle
Ciscomani	Houlahan	Moskowitz
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Moulton
Cleaver	Hudson	Mrvan
Clyburn	Huizenga	Mullin
Cohen	Issa	Murphy
Cole	Ivey	Napolitano
Comer	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Correa	Jackson (NC)	Neguse
Costa	Jackson Lee	Nehls
Courtney	Jacobs	Newhouse
Crawford	James	Nickel
Crenshaw	Jeffries	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Cuellar	Johnson (LA)	Obernolte
Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Omar
D'Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Owens
Dauids (KS)	Jordan	Pallone
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Panetta
Davis (IL)	Joyce (PA)	Pappas
Davis (NC)	Kaptur	Pascarell
De La Cruz	Kean (NJ)	Payne
Dean (PA)	Keating	Pelosi
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Peltola
DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Pence
Deluzio	Kelly (PA)	Perez
Diaz-Balart	Kiggans (VA)	Peters
Dingell	Kildee	Pettersen
Doggett	Kiley	Pfluger
Duarte	Kilmer	Phillips
Duncan	Kim (CA)	Pingree

Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rogers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill

Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Stell
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus

Tokuda
Tonko
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym

ished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2797) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to require certification examinations for accredited investors, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 18, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

YEAS—383

NOES—117

Alford
Barragán
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burlison
Bush
Cammack
Carter (TX)
Casar
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Collins
Connolly
Crane
Crockett
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Donalds
Españillat
Fallon
Finstad
Fischbach
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
García (IL)
García (TX)

Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Hunt
Jackson (TX)
Jayapal
Kamlager-Dove
Khanna
LaHood
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Lesko
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mann
Mast
McCormick
McGovern
Meng
Miller (IL)
Mills
Mooney
Moore (AL)

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Brown
Brownley
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Connolly
Correa
Costa

Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Poster
Foushee
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (TX)
García, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)

Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
James
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latita
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu

Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas

Payne
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rogers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Ogles
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury

Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Stell
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Strong
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—18

Bowman
Bush
Casar
Crockett
Frost
García (IL)

García, Robert
Gomez
Jayapal
Lee (PA)
McGovern
Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
Porter
Pressley
Ramirez
Tlaib
Tokuda

NOT VOTING—34

Auchincloss
Buchanan
Buck
Chavez-DeRemer
Cicilline
Clyburn
Comer
Craig
Crane
Gonzales, Tony
Harris
Himes

Keating
Krishnamoorthi
Luna
Lynch
Magaziner
McBath
McClain
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Moulton
Nadler
Norman

Pascrell
Pelosi
Ross
Ruppersberger
Salazar
Santos
Simpson
Trahan
Velázquez
Wilson (SC)

□ 2129

Mrs. SPARTZ changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOT VOTING—4

Banks
Boebert

Craig
Ross

□ 2121

Mr. MENENDEZ changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 243.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 243.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL INVESTORS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfin-