



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2024

No. 84

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SELF).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 15, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEITH SELF to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, National Women's Health Week empowers women and girls to prioritize their unique health journeys.

A crucial part of that journey is education, prevention, and early detection for illness and disease, like ovarian cancer.

Globally, ovarian cancer is the eighth most common cancer among women, most of whom are over 60 years

old. In the United States, the American Cancer Society estimates that this year, more than 19,000 women will receive a diagnosis of ovarian cancer, and more than 12,000 women will die from ovarian cancer.

It is a frequently missed or misdiagnosed disease, there is no routine screening, and it is not always included as part of an annual gynecological exam like other cancers of the female reproductive system.

I saw this firsthand with my mother's diagnosis and death, within just weeks of her diagnosis of ovarian cancer many years ago, how devastating ovarian cancer can be and how fast it can claim a loved one. We must do better for our mothers, our grandmothers, our grandchildren, our sisters, and our friends.

We must raise awareness, bolster research and education, and pass legislation that prioritizes women's healthcare and saves lives. Our health and our stories matter.

HONORING REV. DR. JOHN E. DOUGLAS

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I pause now to start with something that is of local color and recognizes a man of faith.

I rise today to recognize Reverend Dr. John E. Douglas of Antioch Baptist Church in North Hills, Pennsylvania, as he celebrates 30 years as a pastor.

I first met Pastor Douglas a dozen years ago when I served in the Pennsylvania House for Montgomery County. As I was still getting to know our district, he did not hesitate to welcome me to his church and to introduce me to his neighborhood, which perfectly encompassed his warmth and unwavering commitment to the Antioch community.

Each week, he faithfully leads his congregation in beautiful services with song, prayer, and a welcoming spirit to all. He is a man of family and of faith.

Yet, his devotion does not stop there. Pastor Douglas has made Antioch Bap-

tist Church an integral part of the surrounding community as well, a home for town halls and community gatherings, again, where all are welcome, including me.

I am just one of the so many people who have been guided by his grace, his faith, his leadership, and his friendship, which will continue to grow and shape North Hills and the greater community for years to come.

Congratulations to Pastor Douglas on 30 years of hard work, faith, and joy. The Antioch family and I are blessed to know him.

CELEBRATING 75 YEARS OF THE 193RD AIR OPERATIONS GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 193rd Air Operations Group in State College, Pennsylvania, who celebrated their 75th anniversary on May 2, 2024.

Established in April of 1949, the unit was initially named the 112th Aircraft Control and Warning Squadron. The unit was Federally recognized as part of the Nation's reserve defenses.

A notable alumnus of the squadron is the Honorable Dr. John L. McLucas who served in State College during the 1950s prior to becoming the Secretary of the Air Force in 1973.

In January 2016, the 112th Air Operations Squadron was designated the 193rd Air Operations Group with three subordinate squadrons: the 193rd Air Communication Squadron, the 193rd Air Intelligence Squadron, and the 193rd Combat Operations Squadron. The three squadrons operate under the Air Combat Command.

Since the redesignation, the unit has sent members to more places around the globe than ever before to project

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3207

American air power and to support operations worldwide.

Since 2010, the Air Operations Group took on its current role supporting the U.S. Air Force's central theater as they have completed nine deployments in Doha, Qatar.

During these deployments, the 193rd supported the 609th Air Operations Center, conducting operations vital to the global war on terror and thwarting al-Qaida, ISIS, and Iranian-aligned aggressors in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria.

Additionally, the unit assisted in sustaining military operations throughout the U.S. Central Command area of operations, including 21 Nations in the Middle East, Central Asia, and South Asia.

Mr. Speaker, as the national strategy has begun to focus on defending against near-peer adversaries, the 193rd AOG has excelled at staying agile, informed, and at the tip of the spear for providing combat mission-ready warriors to support operations worldwide.

The members of the 193rd have most recently supported U.S. Indo-Pacific Command exercises in line with the national strategy to train and meet the increasing threat posed by China.

Additionally, the 193rd has participated in the Pennsylvania National Guard State partnership program with Lithuania, conducting military training and readiness with a strategic military ally.

Mr. Speaker, I personally thank those who previously and currently serve the 193rd AOG for their dedication and service to our great Nation, and I congratulate them on 75 years of operations.

HONORING OFFICER BRIAN SICKNICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise during Police Week to honor a son of New Jersey's 12th District who gave his life protecting many of the people that are Members of this Chamber.

Brian Sicknick was raised in South River, New Jersey. He attended East Brunswick Technical High School where he dreamed of being a police officer.

He later joined the New Jersey Air Force National Guard's 108th Wing at McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey.

Officer Sicknick served in Operation Enduring Freedom, attaining the rank of staff sergeant. He later moved to Springfield, Virginia, and joined the United States Capitol Police. One of his first assignments was the inauguration of President Obama.

For 12 years, Officer Sicknick was a dedicated protector of our Capitol. On January 6, 2021, he found himself at the front lines on the Capitol's west side, facing off against a violent mob bent on dismantling our democracy.

He came under repeated attacks but held his post, defending the lives of the people who had been elected, their staff, and employees of this Capitol. Later that night, Officer Sicknick collapsed at the Capitol and sadly passed away the next day.

Officer Brian Sicknick gave his life defending our democracy against an insurrection fomented by the former President of the United States of America, who is currently on trial.

Were it not for that insurrection, Officer Sicknick would still be with us today. Were it not for the heroism of Officer Sicknick and his fellow USCP officers, we would not be here today.

For those who were not with us on that day, it must be hard to imagine the danger of the moment, how close we came to losing everything, particularly our lives and our democracy.

We have a responsibility to the officers who defended the Capitol on that day and who still protect us now to ensure that never again shall they be called upon to sacrifice in such a way.

I will be forever grateful to Officer Sicknick and his fellow USCP and Metro Police Department officers for defending my life, for the lives of my colleagues, and most importantly, for our democracy. We are all forever in his debt.

THE GREAT STATE OF IOWA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my home State of Iowa being ranked the sixth overall State to live in.

Scoring third in opportunity and in the top 10 for education, Iowa has proven that regardless of where you come from or where you are going, you can find success in the Hawkeye State.

Looking for a great place to study? Iowa has some of the Nation's top schools. Want to buy a house and start a family? Iowa is one of the most affordable States to live in and a beautiful State to raise a family.

Want to start a new career? Iowa is home to several booming industries, entrepreneurship flourishes, and we would be happy to have you.

Iowa is historically known for being a farming State, but recently our State has emerged as one of the Nation's leaders in clean energy production.

In Iowa, the American Dream is alive, well, and waiting for you. God bless the Hawkeye State.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Teacher Appreciation Day, which took place this past Tuesday on May 7.

America's teachers are heroes who take on the monumental task of shaping our Nation's future leaders with the utmost grandeur and grit.

Growing up, we never forget those teachers who have left a marked im-

pact on our lives and mentor us through the grueling process of maturation.

As a matter of fact, I remember my second grade teacher, Ms. Tenniswood in Michigan, who helped me to know that I was special enough to one day achieve my dreams.

Thanks to the tireless efforts of America's teachers, our upcoming generation stands poised to confront the complexities of the future with resilience and readiness.

Iowa is home to over 35,000 teachers who play a key role in the future of our State. As we honor their invaluable contributions, let us unite in recognition of their dedication and pray for their continued success in nurturing the youth and steering the course of America's future.

Together, let us commit to supporting and uplifting our educators who are the bedrock of our society.

NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Nurses Week, which takes place from May 6 to May 12 every year.

In 1974, President Nixon declared that one week in May should be dedicated to our amazing nurses. Then in 1993, the American Nurses Association board of directors declared that May 6 through May 12 would be the official dates, coinciding with National Nurses Day on May 6 and Florence Nightingale's birthday on May 12.

As someone who has dedicated their life to healthcare and public service and was a former nurse before becoming a physician and married to a nurse, I can confidently say that our nurses are community heroes. The sacrifices they make for the well-being of our communities are commendable.

Let's take a moment to express our heartfelt gratitude to these dedicated healthcare heroes and thank them for their unwavering care and compassion.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week. National Police Week stands as a beacon of honor, remembrance, and solidarity, allowing us to pay homage to the heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

Since its inception in 1962 by President John F. Kennedy, this week holds profound significance as we commemorate Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15 and the surrounding days as Police Week.

It is a time when tens of thousands of law enforcement officers, survivors, and citizens converge on our Nation's Capital to partake in events that honor and remember our fallen heroes.

National Police Week isn't just a commemoration; it is a testament to the resilience and dedication of those who wear the badge. It is a reminder that the sacrifices made by our law enforcement officers will never be forgotten.

Let us stand together in gratitude and solidarity, honoring the heroes

who have given their all for the safety and well-being of others. In Iowa, we will always back the blue.

□ 1015

HONORING COACH LISA BLUDER

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the incomparable career and influence of Iowa women's basketball Coach Lisa Bluder, who announced her retirement from coaching this week.

In her 24-year career coaching the Hawkeyes, she has led the team to five Big 10 tournament championships and two Final Fours. She is finishing her tenure as the Big Ten's winningest women's basketball coach of all time. Her wide-ranging influence over women's basketball is undeniable, and her time spent mentoring and molding young women into this generation's elite assembly of athletes is worthy of the utmost commendation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Coach Bluder's immaculate career and in wishing her well on a well-earned retirement.

As always, go Hawkeyes, and I congratulate Coach Bluder.

HONORING DR. ASSAD MEYMANDI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOLINARO). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable life and extraordinary legacy of Dr. Assad Meymandi, who sadly passed away last week.

Born in Iran, Dr. Meymandi moved to the United States in 1955 and quickly fell in love with this country. He moved to Raleigh, North Carolina, after receiving his medical degree from George Washington University. He dedicated much of his career to improving mental health care in our State at a time when mental health was much less understood.

His place in the community is also marked by his dedication to the arts. He believed in the power of the arts so much that we can thank him for the creation of the Meymandi Concert Hall, home to North Carolina's Symphony, where thousands of people go every year to hear the breathtaking music and to experience the concert hall's renowned acoustics.

Dr. Meymandi always said that he was an American by choice, not by birth, and that he loved his country so much that he celebrated his naturalization date as his true birthday. His love for America and for our Raleigh community should serve as a guiding light to all of us.

HONORING THE VICTIMS AND HEROES OF THE ALLEN PREMIUM OUTLET TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in solemn reflection in the wake of the first anniversary of the devastating mass shooting at the Allen Premium Outlet Mall.

I stand to pay tribute to the eight cherished souls we mourn from that fateful day and to commend the courageous actions of the countless heroes in our community whose swift response mitigated what could have been an even greater tragedy.

On May 6, 2023, the community of Allen, Texas, faced a harrowing ordeal as a lone gunman unleashed terror upon innocent shoppers and workers in the Allen Premium Outlet Mall. Amidst the chaos and devastation, our first responders' collective bravery and swift actions exemplified the highest standards of courage and professionalism as they selflessly risked their safety to protect and assist those in harm's way.

Therefore, I extend my deepest gratitude and solemn appreciation to the individuals, departments, and agencies whose acts of valor undoubtedly saved lives and provided comfort and reassurance to a grieving community.

In remembrance of the innocent lives lost—Kyu Song Cho, Cindy Cho, James Cho, Elio Cumana-Rivas, Christian LaCour, Daniela Mendoza, Sofia Mendoza, and Aishwarya Thatikonda—we honor their memory and offer our sincerest condolences to their families and loved ones.

I reaffirm my commitment to combating senseless acts of violence and fostering communities of peace and safety. May this proclamation stand as a testament to the resilience, compassion, and spirit of unity that define our Nation in the face of adversity.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of those individuals and organizations who assisted.

ALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

Ofc. Dominique Akins, Ofc. David Childers, Ofc. Ryan Dexter, Ofc. John Pena, Ofc. Lane Pollan, Ofc. Daryl Whitehead, Ofc. Rory Kelly, Ofc. Brett Anderson, Ofc. CJ Rider, Corporal Dillon Egizi, Corporal Kyle Griffith, Sgt. Chadwick Hernandez, Lt. Ty Latham, Lt. Kris Wirstrom.

ALLEN FIRE DEPARTMENT

Jake Blackshear, Hunter Bostick, Dean Boyce, Jonathan Boyd, Kristopher Bravo, Hunter Brent, Zach Caldwell, David Cannaday, Chase Condor, Tony Cooper, Marcus Corey, James Cummings, Hannah DeGan, Brandon Derrick, Elton Grant, Greg Grimes, Sam Herber, Jillian Hernandez, Brian Hoverman, Jared Inman, Payton Lambert, Paul Lopez, Matt Madding, Steve McCormick, Marc Morrow, Roger Nolen, Jeffrey Peters, Mark Randle, Simeon Royal, Nolan Skidmore, Justin Sullivan, Greg Truitt, Luis Vargas, Michael Wade, Daniel Williams, Michael Wilson.

COUNTY

Collin County Sheriff's Office, Collin County Constable 1, Collin County Constable 3.

MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Dallas PD, McKinney PD, Frisco PD, Fairview PD, Hickory Creek PD, Prosper PD, Wylie PD, Plano PD.

MUNICIPAL FIRE DEPARTMENTS

McKinney Fire, Plano Fire, Fairview Fire, Frisco Fire, Prosper Fire, Lucas Fire, Princeton Fire.

STATE

Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas Alcohol Beverage Commission.

STOP SPENDING MONEY WE DON'T HAVE

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, the everyday people of America can't stand at this podium and talk about the crushing inflation Washington's spending has created. The single mothers struggling to put food on the table don't have a voting card to vote against the spending that fuels food price increases. Young families struggling to buy a home can't give a speech on the House floor about the surging home prices and mortgage rates.

We are their voice. We are their Representatives, or at least we are supposed to be, but based on the tax-and-spend policies of the administration and the blowout omnibus packages forced through this Congress by many of my own colleagues, I might add, I don't think Congress is doing a very good job listening to America.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed two massive spending packages, continuing the blowout COVID expansion and leaving NANCY PELOSI's spending levels in the dust.

What did Americans get for it? What did they get for their money? They didn't get a secure border. They didn't get safer cities. They sure didn't get a better economy.

Mr. Speaker, do you know who did benefit from the blowout spending? LGBTQ youth organizations, transgender organizations, abortion facilities, and the FBI, which got a brand-new headquarters and expanded authority to spy on Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington establishment is addicted to spending my constituents' money, and it is never enough. We are \$34 trillion in debt, and it is still never enough.

I have no doubt there are plans brewing right now in this murky swamp to clear the decks—that is the phrase—and use the upcoming appropriations to force through more spending and more leftwing poison pills with nothing to actually secure our border and significantly cut spending to stimulate our economy. It doesn't have to be this way.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents and Texas District Three, I urge my colleagues to wake up. Stop spending money we don't have and commit to cutting wasteful government spending. We must bring prosperity back to the hardworking Americans.

HONORING DON LEE BLANKENSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my very good friend, Don Lee Blankenship.

Don was a husband, grandfather, and longtime Orange County resident, a lifelong law enforcement officer who proudly served the city of Santa Ana for 25 years. As president of the Police Officers Association, he represented those whom we refer to as the thin blue line that protects our communities.

Don was also passionate about honoring fallen officers and dedicated over 20 years to the California Peace Officers' Memorial Foundation, where we worked together to remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Don was also a devout member of Santiago de Compostela Catholic Church. He loved to volunteer there, spend time with his family, and support Notre Dame football.

Today, I join Don's children, grandchildren, neighbors, and friends in remembering his legacy. I thank Don for his dedication and protection of the Santa Ana community.

HONORING SERGEANT MIKE GONZALEZ

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Sergeant Mike Gonzalez, who served our country and our Santa Ana community for 32 years.

Sergeant Gonzalez served in the U.S. Navy for 7 years. He was born and raised in North Carolina but soon came to love our Orange County community and served the residents of the city of Santa Ana for 32 years as a police officer.

Sergeant Gonzalez is a hero on and off duty. On duty, he received service medals for his valor as a police officer. Off duty, he sprang into action in 2017 during a mass shooting in Las Vegas, where he saved many lives.

I thank my good friend, Mike, for his service to our country and community. He represents the best Orange County has to offer.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Police Week and the brave men and women who serve and protect Orange County.

Beginning under President Kennedy in 1962, Police Week recognizes those who protect our neighborhoods. We also remember the brave men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

Back home in Orange County, our police officers are essential to keeping our community safe. I am proud to have brought back \$3 million just this year to renovate and upgrade police headquarters in Fullerton and Stanton.

I thank all the police officers at home and across the country for keeping us and keeping our neighborhoods safe. We are proud to have their service.

HONORING THE STATUE UNVEILING OF THE REVEREND WILLIAM FRANKLIN "BILLY" GRAHAM, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 1932, North Carolina will receive a new statue representing our State in the U.S. Capitol tomorrow.

The late Reverend Billy Graham, Jr., was a very cherished Christian leader and an exemplary North Carolinian. I am proud to welcome him into the U.S. Capitol's National Statuary Hall Collection.

Born on a dairy farm in Charlotte, North Carolina, Reverend Graham came from humble beginnings. He grew up learning the value of hard work and developed an unwavering commitment to our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Through his ministry, he would go on to reach more than 200 million people in 185 countries, and many of those who heard his message accepted Jesus as Lord and Savior. I have no doubt he led millions to Christ, securing their salvation.

Known as America's pastor, he is one of the few private citizens to receive three of the highest honors that are bestowed by Congress: the Congressional Gold Medal in 1996, lying in honor in the U.S. Capitol Rotunda in 2018, and now a statue placed in the U.S. Capitol Building.

Created by Charlotte-based artist Chas Fagan, the statue depicts Reverend Graham pointing to an open Bible. Inscribed on the pedestal of the 7-foot statue will be the verse so foundational, John 3:16. This well-known Scripture tells us: "For God so loved the world that He gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in Him shall not perish but have eternal life."

At a time when America could use a spiritual revival like never before, how refreshing and great it is that we are enshrining this verse and Reverend Graham's legacy of faith within the Halls of Congress.

As noted in his 2011 book, "Nearing Home," Billy Graham wrote: "The greatest legacy you can pass on to your children and grandchildren is not your money or the other material things you have accumulated in life. The greatest legacy you can pass on to them is the legacy of your character and your faith. . . . Why is faith our greatest legacy? Because the memory of what we were like—not just our personalities but our character and our faith—has the potential to influence others for Christ."

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Graham dedicated his life to proclaiming the Gospel throughout the world and, I might add, in places and countries that were and in many that still are hostile to Christianity. I am proud that countless visitors and lawmakers will now be able to honor his legacy and message for generations to come in the U.S. Capitol.

MAGIC OF THE PACK

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight, honor, and celebrate the NC State University men's and women's basketball teams. Both reached the Final Four of their respec-

tive NCAA Division 1 basketball tournaments this past month of April, registering a historic achievement that few schools have ever achieved.

□ 1030

The NC State women's team led by Coach Wes Moore displayed strength all year with a 31-7 overall record, including 9 wins over AP Top 25 teams while earning their first Final Four appearance since 1998. They had state-ment wins in the tournament against Chattanooga, Tennessee, Stanford, and Texas. Junior guard, Aziaha James, was the leader of the Pack with blistering accuracy from three-point range.

Not to be outdone, the men's basketball team won the school's 11th ACC Tournament championship. The Wolfpack, led by Coach Kevin Keatts clenched an 84-76 victory against incredibly talented UNC-Chapel Hill, becoming the first ACC team to win 5 games in 5 days, securing their spot in the NCAA Tournament, and launching them to their first Final Four appearance since the magical championship run of the 1983 NC State team.

This team's collective skill, dedication to each other, and the team chemistry they solidified in the ACC Tournament enabled the Wolfpack to keep advancing, reeling off wins against Texas Tech, Oakland, Marquette, and Duke. With each round of the NCAA Tournament, the Wolfpack continued to excel and win.

As an NC State alumnus, it is with great pride that I join so many in celebrating these two teams and their accomplishments. Only a select few universities can say that both of their basketball teams made the Final Four in their respective tournaments in the same year. Both teams, as well as the individual players, will be long remembered. Their legacy is now etched in NC State basketball lore.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the courage and the sacrifice of the brave law enforcement officers who work each day to keep our communities safe and to honor those who have given their lives.

This week, as we commemorate Police Week, a week of appreciation and of solemnity that was first honored and created back in 1962, when President Kennedy designated May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which it falls Police Week, we know that this week draws between 25,000 and 40,000 attendees from across the Nation, including from Virginia; people who come to honor the sacrifice and the service of their fellow officers and their family members.

I grew up in a law enforcement household. My father was a career law

enforcement officer, and I grew up with a deep appreciation of those who commit themselves to service. I stand here today during National Police Week to recognize every officer who works to keep Virginia's communities safe.

I am proud to represent many brave men and women who have answered the call to serve their fellow Americans, their neighbors, and our communities, and I am grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

This week, we remember with reverence their colleagues and friends who have laid down their lives in the line of duty. We owe these heroes a debt of gratitude that can never fully be repaid. Their legacies live on in the continued dedication of the officers who served alongside them and the families who mourn and miss them.

In Congress, I will continue to advocate for legislation to support our local police departments and sheriff's departments in carrying out the vital mission that they hold in our communities.

Together, we can honor their dedication to duty by connecting them with the resources, the training, the support, and everything necessary for them to perform their jobs effectively, and importantly, to get home safely.

To all those who wear the badge, I offer my deepest gratitude. This week and every week, we extend our appreciation to the men and women who continue to serve, and we remember those who did not come home. May their sacrifice never be forgotten, and may their legacies continue to inspire the next generation to serve and protect.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TERRY ANDERSON

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable life and the legacy of a former constituent, Mr. Terry Anderson.

When I was first running for Congress, I had the occasion of meeting someone who was known to be a local advocate and a local activist, but the name was familiar to me, Terry Anderson. I met with this gentleman, and I heard his story. It was one that was familiar to me from my childhood and one that was familiar probably to many of you.

In 1985, Mr. Anderson became quite well known the world over when he was kidnapped in Lebanon and held hostage by Hezbollah until his release in the very late days of 1991.

He was kidnapped when he was a reporter for the Associated Press. He was a correspondent who fearlessly pursued truth in some of the world's most volatile regions. His commitment to on-the-ground eyewitness reporting was unwavering.

This continued his path as he had begun his inquisitive time in life through his service in the Marine Corps where he rose to the rank of staff sergeant, and he saw combat during the Vietnam war.

It was from this time when he was in captivity in Lebanon that he brought

back home a support for those who continue the mission of collecting knowledge, who continue the mission of reporting hard facts on the ground.

Mr. Anderson continued to advocate for press freedom worldwide throughout the remainder of his career. Once he returned back home to the United States, he lived in many places. He even once ran for elected office in Ohio. He taught university-level journalism. He opened a few restaurants, a horse ranch, and a blues bar. For a time, he lived on a farm in Orange County, Virginia, which is when I had the opportunity to meet him, and, frankly, eat some of his extraordinary cooking.

Terry was a man of many interests. He was a man of great passion. He was a man who loved and spoke often of his children. He was a man who inspired me. I am grateful I had the opportunity to meet him, to learn from him, and upon his passing, I wish his family the very best.

Towards the end of his life he once remarked: I have lived so much, and I have done so much; I am content. His legacy has left an indelible mark on our world. His resilience and his courage have set an example for so many of us. I ask my colleagues to please join me in remembering Terry Anderson.

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 2023, the Palestinian terrorist group, Hamas, viciously attacked Israel—America's best ally in the Middle East—and they did it from the Gaza Strip. On that day, more than 1,200 Israelis and foreign nationals, including at least 35 Americans, were killed. Not since the Holocaust have so many Jews been killed in a single day.

During the unprecedented attack, Hamas, in conjunction with other terrorist groups, seized 253 hostages, many of whom are still held captive today, and we know for a fact that some were murdered while in captivity by Hamas. The barbaric attacks against Israel on October 7 were of a scope and lethality not witnessed ever before in the 16 years of Hamas' control in Gaza.

The U.S.-Israel alliance is founded upon our shared democratic and cultural values, our mutual security interests, and an enduring friendship. I say we have spiritual connections. Also, there are moral reasons to support Israel. There needs to be a safe haven for Jews all over this world that have been persecuted for several thousand years.

We support the Abraham Accords. These accords reflect our mutual respect for our partnership and the significance that the pursuit of peace in the region holds for the United States and Israel—a peace vital to the national security of both of our countries.

Israel is a vibrant democracy with a government elected by the people of Israel. Israel is a sovereign nation with a right to self-defense and self-determination.

No country, including the United States, has the right to tell Israel whether or how to conduct wartime operations in response to a devastating terrorist attack. We certainly have no right to demand that Israel submit to a cease-fire. This course of action is for the leadership of the military of Israel to determine. It is for the people of Israel to determine.

In addition, no country has the right or authority to suggest that the Prime Minister of Israel should resign. Only the citizens of Israel have this right. Israel is a sovereign and capable nation with a right to determine who will serve in the government and how it wants to defend itself, and only Israel can determine its security needs after the fall of Hamas.

Sadly, our President has called for a cease-fire, and Leader SCHUMER has called for a new election—disregarding and interfering in Israel's sovereignty.

We also see the administration is calling for a two-state solution. So I ask: Who is Israel going to negotiate with? Who on the Palestinian side acknowledges Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state? Who on the Palestinian side is committed to peace and the rejection of terrorism?

Pushing for a two-state solution with the current Palestinian leadership is a fool's errand. The Palestinian leaders want a one-state solution where there is no Israel. So who are the Israelis supposed to negotiate with? Who are the trusted Palestinian leaders for Israel to talk to? There are none.

Last month, Congress voted to send much-needed munitions to Israel. Iran has fired 330 munitions recently. The Israeli air defenses are depleted. Their precision munitions are also depleted.

The President has halted sending these needed weapons after Congress approved them and directed them to be sent there because he is trying to prevent Israel from going into the last stronghold of Hamas, which is Rafah.

Israel can't let Hamas and Gaza survive. If they do, Hamas will continue to be a mortal threat. Israel needs to go and finish the job quickly so humanitarian aid can get to the Palestinian people, and the President should get out of the way. The United States should continue to support Israel, to stand with Israel in the face of attacks, not only from Hamas but from anti-Semitic nations throughout the world, particularly with the United Nations.

The United States should continue to assist Israel with the means to defend itself. Israel is a longtime friend and ally, and our policies toward Israel should be consistent and in line with that history. American politics and election year concerns should have no role in the United States' foreign policy with Israel.

In short, the administration and the majority leader and the Senate must

stop meddling in Israel's politics. The goal for Israel is to destroy Hamas so that no more terrorist acts can be conducted from Gaza. They are trying to provide security for their people. We would do the same thing just like we did after 9/11.

RECOGNIZING COLVIN RANCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. PEREZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colvin Ranch, a family-owned ranch in Thurston County in my district.

Colvin Ranch started soon after Ignatius Colvin came to Washington State on the Oregon Trail back in 1851. Since then, the family has continued to raise livestock in a humane and sustainable way. The ranch is currently run by Jennifer Colvin, making her a fifth-generation rancher.

Local farms are the backbone of a resilient and sustainable local food supply chain. However, in recent years we have seen growing consolidation in the agricultural industry. Multinational, corporate-run farms are known to cut corners and prioritize profit over community-minded farming practices.

Colvin Ranch has been an advocate for building a meat processing plant with a storefront in the park near their ranch so they can establish what they like to call "the world's shortest supply chain."

By supporting farmers like Colvin Ranch, we are investing in sustainable agriculture practices and supporting our local economy and local jobs.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Police Week to recognize the brave men and women in law enforcement across southwest Washington.

Recently, I had the honor of going on a ride-along with Sergeant Ripp of the Vancouver Police Department, and I had the pleasure of watching his profound knowledge and deep engagement with the local community. He literally knew 9 out of 10 people we saw walking on the streets, what their lives were like, what their struggles were, and how he could support them.

Sergeant Ripp talked to me about the biggest challenges he sees in our community, including the increasing devastation of drugs like fentanyl and meth, as well as the challenges of folks struggling with serious mental health issues.

The work our officers do is dangerous and often unrewarding, and I am deeply committed to ensuring they receive the resources, regard, and support they deserve.

By providing our law enforcement adequate funding and ensuring they are given the respect and support they deserve, communities like mine will be able to recruit and retain the best public servants possible.

You cannot pay people enough to be disrespected, and we need a cultural

shift that values the sacrifices these officers make along with their families.

I am so grateful to have such a strong team working in my district. I sincerely thank them all.

RECOGNIZING ANDREW WEBBER

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Andrew Webber, a proud husband, father, and veteran who was raised in Raymond, a small town in my district.

Last year, Andrew signed up to volunteer for the Ukrainian army's 59th Motorized Brigade.

He went to Ukraine in order to provide combat training to their soldiers; however, when he noticed that a young man next to him did not have any protective gear, Andrew gave him his.

Andrew passed away on July 29 of 2023 while serving in Ukraine. To this day, his family firmly believes his death would have been prevented if the Ukrainians had proper resources.

That is why it is critical and crucial that after passing the House and Senate on April 24, the President signed the lethal military aid package to send \$61 billion to Ukrainian soldiers.

Andrew was a soldier, but he was also a father, a husband, and a son. My thoughts are with Andrew's family and loved ones as they navigate their profound loss. His heroic service and sacrifice will not be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING DORIS BIER

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Doris Bier, who was one of the original Rosie the Riveters during World War II in Fort Lewis.

Doris was raised in Adna, Washington, a small town in my community. From owning the second bicycle in Adna to being hired to drive trucks in cornfields at the age of 14, she has always surpassed expectations.

At the age of 16, she was one of just a few chosen women, along with a few other women, to take a mechanics course at the Clover Park Vocational School.

□ 1045

Upon graduation, she became an official Rosie the Riveter and worked at assembly lines at Mount Rainier Ordnance Depot. No matter what pushback she faced, she continued to work and excel. Doris received an Army-Navy E Award, also known as an Excellence in Production pin, for producing twice as many axles as her colleagues each day.

Doris Bier, along with all of the Rosie the Riveters, helped pave the way for freedom. She still resides in my district where she continues to share her remarkable stories.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Doris for all she has contributed and still contributes to our community.

LEWIS COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITY DEPARTMENT

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five Lewis County Public Utility Department crew workers who were recently honored by the Northwest Public Power Association with a Safety Heroism Award.

On January 22, Brad Peters, Bob Hadley, Joel Chandler, Travis Merriman, and Hunter Blair saved the life of man who was disabled by pulling him out of a burning RV.

The five PUD crew workers were working in the Mossyrock area when they noticed smoke nearby. While attempting to extinguish the fire, they realized a man was trapped inside and was not able to escape on his own.

Our PUD workers are crucial to our community, but saving lives is well out of their expected duty. The quick thinking and choices of these five men was literally lifesaving, and I applaud them for their heroic work.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Police Week.

As a Nation, we pay tribute to the law enforcement officers who have lost their lives while performing their duties. We honor their commitment, bravery, and selflessness in protecting and serving our communities.

The sacrifices made by these officers extend far beyond their own lives, affecting the lives of their spouses, children, and extended family members who will forever carry the weight of their loss.

We are thankful for the service they gave, the courage they exhibited, and the example they set. We honor their legacy and commitment to protecting and serving communities across the Nation.

As the crime rates seem to skyrocket across the Nation, including in my district, the territory of Guam, our police officers' duties become even more critical to every one of our jurisdictions. National Police Week gives us the chance to show our gratitude to those officers who continue to safeguard our streets and neighborhoods.

Pictured next to me are several officers from the Guam Police Department who serve as the backbone of our island's fight against crime. It is not uncommon for them to respond to calls with little to no information on what they are walking into, yet they do so with courage.

Additionally, our police department has been quite understaffed to combat the level of crime we are experiencing, yet they still manage to provide effective service and public safety. This is why we have submitted CPF requests for patrol cars, mobile commands, and other necessities to better equip our men and women in blue.

Our officers work long hours, put their lives on the line, and are always willing to go the extra mile to ensure our island residents are okay. Often this is a challenging job that takes a toll on one's physical and mental state, but I am here to ensure that they are recognized and appreciated for their

service and sacrifice. Today and every day we honor their commitment, bravery, and selflessness in protecting and serving our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the men and women in blue.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. RALPH GUERRERO
SABLAN

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an influential figure from my district who has made extraordinary contributions to the field of medicine, the late Dr. Ralph Guerrero Sablan.

Dr. Sablan sadly left this Earth several weeks ago and was well known throughout Guam as a talented physician through his exceptional skills, compassionate care, and unwavering dedication to his patients.

Dr. Sablan became interested in medicine after experiencing a life-threatening situation early in life. His uncle, Dr. Ramon Sablan, who was the first Chamorro physician, saved his life. This incident instilled in him a lifelong passion for pursuing a career in medicine.

Upon completing medical school, Dr. Sablan joined the United States Navy. He was stationed at the U.S. Naval Hospital in San Diego and provided medical services at Camp Pendleton. He was soon transferred to the U.S. Naval Hospital on Guam.

From 1968 to 1969, Dr. Sablan was deployed to Vietnam where he served in Da Nang and Saigon. He received the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, and the Navy Unit Commendation. Upon request from Delegate Antonio B. Won Pat, Dr. Sablan was reassigned to U.S. Naval Hospital in Guam in 1970.

After 20 years of service, Dr. Sablan retired from Guam's U.S. Naval Hospital. In his last tour of duty, he served as the executive officer and chief of clinical services. Following that, he practiced an additional 30 years as the sole dermatologist for Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Micronesia.

As a skilled and distinguished physician on the island of Guam, Dr. Sablan has been a shining example of loyal devotion to duty and service.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor him today and pay tribute to his exemplary military service, leadership, and life's work to the people of Guam.

May he rest in peace.

CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE XI LAMBDA CHAPTER OF ALPHA PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY, INC., ON ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the numerous accomplishments and influences of the Xi Lambda chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity based in Chicago, Illinois.

As we all know, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity stands as the oldest and largest fraternity for African-American men in the United States. As one of the most renowned chapters of the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, the Xi Lambda chapter proudly celebrates its centennial anniversary today, May 15, 2024. As a proud Alpha myself, I commend my brothers wholeheartedly on this monumental milestone.

Established on May 15, 1924, in Chicago, Illinois, by 22 community and organizational leaders, including Dr. Henry Callis, a founding member of the national Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, the Xi Lambda chapter has become one of the largest and most prestigious chapters in the world. Since its inception, the Xi Lambda chapter has made significant educational, social, financial, and cultural contributions to the city of Chicago and its surrounding areas.

For example, the Xi Lambda chapter operates both local and national programs, such as the Xi Lambda Educational Foundation that encourages the education of our Nation's youth through scholarships and mentorships.

Additionally, as leaders and pioneers of our communities, the members of the Xi Lambda chapter established a computer lab school for inner-city youth back in the 1980s, well before the advent of mainstream computer usage. For decades, the chapter has also focused on eradicating the disenfranchisement and suppression of Black voters through its A Voteless People is a Hopeless People voter empowerment campaign.

Currently, the Xi Lambda chapter serves as the home chapter of the sitting general president of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., Dr. Willis L. Lonzer III, and notable business leaders including: John H. Johnson, Tom Burrell, Paul King, and Robert King.

The Xi Lambda chapter also proudly claims many members who have served in the U.S. judicial system, as well as in the Congress, such as Senator Roland Burris and Representatives William Dawson, Bennett Stewart, and Ralph Metcalfe. Other notables of Xi Lambda chapter include: Jesse Owens, John Hope Franklin, and E. Franklin Frazier.

It is worth noting that presently in the city of Chicago there are 23 public buildings named in honor of Xi Lambda brothers, including schools, parks, and the downtown Federal courthouse that is named for Ralph Metcalfe.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I applaud the contributions, leadership, and service the Xi Lambda chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha has provided to our communities, country, and the world at large over the past 100 years or more, all of the accomplishments that I expressed. I express my strong support in recognizing May 15, 2024, as Alpha Phi Alpha Xi Lambda Chapter Day in the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING HUNTER GRIFFITHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone whose service has been important to the welfare of constituents in Arizona's Eighth Congressional District, Hunter Griffiths.

I appreciate Hunter's dedicated service to the Eighth District as a community outreach liaison in my Surprise, Arizona, District Office. In just a short period of time, Hunter built relationships with stakeholders and constituents across the district. As Hunter interacted with the community, he educated constituents on our available services and connected them to critical casework services that aided in the office's ability to return nearly \$400,000 directly to constituents.

I thank Hunter for his service to the Eighth Congressional District. His dedication and determination were critical to the success of our constituent service programs and improved the lives of those living in the District.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR SKIP HALL

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone whose commitment to public service and to their community will stand the test of time, Surprise, Arizona, Mayor Skip Hall.

Mayor Hall began his life of public service as a member of the city of Surprise Planning and Zoning Commission before running for city councilman in April 2008. He went on to be reelected in 2009 before being redistricted and being elected again in August 2018.

While serving as a city councilman, Hall also began his time in the mayor's office where he served as vice mayor in 2011 and 2014. In November of 2018, he was chosen to fill a vacancy by the Surprise City Council and began his mayoral tenure.

Since becoming mayor, Hall has generated budget surpluses, restored fiscal health to the city, and has made Surprise, Arizona, the thriving community it is today. He has even brought thousands of new jobs to the city through investments from Amazon and more.

Mayor Hall has accomplished all these things while maintaining strong public safety, increasing water sustainability, and strengthening the city's infrastructure. His impact on the city of Surprise cannot be overstated, and he will be dearly missed when his term ends in December.

On behalf of Arizona's Eighth Congressional District, I thank Mayor Hall for his years of service.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR JASON BECK

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a strong leader in Arizona whose commitment to America and his community has set a remarkable example, mayor of Peoria, Mayor Jason Beck.

Mayor Beck began his career as a Marine Corps reservist before going on

to found Diamond Tactical and eventually founding and becoming CEO of TYR Tactical, the leading global manufacturer of tactical gear and equipment for military and law enforcement.

While successfully leading his company as CEO, Beck also began his career as in public service when he announced his run for Peoria mayor on a promise of realizing Peoria's full potential.

In realizing this potential, Mayor Beck has secured increased funding for Peoria's fire and medical departments and added more law enforcement positions.

Mayor Beck's accomplishments for the city have made Peoria somewhere people are proud to be from, proud to work in, and proud to raise a family. As a Peoria resident, I applaud his commitment to our community.

□ 1100

HONORING ARIZONA'S POLICE OFFICERS

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Arizona's police officers. They are honorable men and women who protect us each and every day.

I promise I will always fight against the defund our police movement. I promise I will protect qualified immunity for our law enforcement. I promise that I will always stand with the men and women in blue.

PROTECTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today nearly 3 months since Burnsville lost Police Officers Matthew Ruge and Paul Elmstrand and Firefighter-Paramedic Adam Finseth in the line of duty.

They answered a domestic call early one Sunday morning, where seven children were being held inside a home by an armed gunman. A tactical vehicle from the city of Rosemount was a critical part of the emergency response that day.

Look at these photos beside me. Take a long look at these photos. Forty-one shots from a gunman's rifle hit this vehicle as officers from Rosemount and Apple Valley tried to help their brothers. We may have had even more injury and, God forbid, death that day without this vehicle.

It was 3 months ago when I stood on the House floor and pledged to honor Matthew, Paul, and Adam's lives by giving the first responders who keep our communities safe the support they need on the ground. That is why, today, I am introducing the Protect Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would allow local law enforcement to purchase vehicles like the one used in Burnsville with Federal funds, which is currently restricted by the Federal Government.

Law enforcement's multiple missions are harder and more dangerous than

ever before. They are routinely put in harm's way. This National Police Week, let's honor them by protecting them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will save lives, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

THANKING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women who wear the badge and put their lives on the line to serve us, protect us, and keep our communities safe. I proudly back our women and men in blue, and National Police Week is an opportunity for our Nation to come together and thank the law enforcement community.

According to a recent study, 58 percent of Americans believe reducing crime should be a top priority for the President and Congress to address, yet some Washington Democrats maintain their calls to defund the police.

We must reject that nonsense and support the brave men and women who serve on the front line by collecting accurate data to address the rise in antipolice attacks, empowering law enforcement to detain any illegal immigrant charged with or convicted of assaulting a law enforcement officer, and ensuring our officers have access to a variety of mental health services as they bear the weight of protecting their neighbors and our communities.

This body will have the opportunity to offer that support this week by voting "yes" on bills that will do just that.

Americans deserve to live in an environment that is safe and secure. It is not lost on me that our law enforcement plays the most significant role in securing and defending that safety. We are grateful.

EVERY STATE IN AMERICA IS A BORDER STATE

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, 370 days ago, this body passed the Secure the Border Act of 2023. After President Biden's policies created the worst humanitarian crisis in our Nation's history, House Republicans rallied together to end the crisis and secure the southern border.

Sadly, some Washington Democrats are more loyal to progressive activists than to keeping Americans safe. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather leave the border wide open than consider our legislation. In the meantime, America suffers.

Since House Republicans passed H.R. 2, there have been more than 2.1 million encounters with illegal immigrants trying to enter the country at the southern border. Nearly 120 of those individuals' names appear on the terrorist watch list, and almost 33,000 of them have some sort of criminal background.

In the past year alone, our Border Patrol agents have seized enough fentanyl to kill 3.8 billion people. That is the entire population of the United States, China, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Brazil combined.

It doesn't matter what the White House says. The numbers don't lie. President Biden's policies are failing, and our country is less secure because of it.

Under President Biden, every State in America is a border State. Kansas and the Big First feel that, and that is why they are so concerned about President Biden's border crisis.

In my commitment to the Big First, I pledged that I would fight for a nation that is secure and work to end the crisis at the border. That commitment is one of the reasons why I supported H.R. 2.

Rather than working with House Republicans to fix the President's crisis, Senate Democrats have decided to let H.R. 2 just sit in the legislative graveyard. In the meantime, Mexican cartels are more empowered while more drugs and more crime pour into our country over the border.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better than this. Our children deserve to live in a country where they are safe and secure. It is beyond time for President Biden to work with House Republicans to secure the southern border. Enough is enough.

ELIMINATE BARRIERS TO REPORTING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND HARASSMENT IN THE COAST GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last night, the U.S. House of Representatives voted in an overwhelming majority, 376-16, to pass H.R. 7659, the Coast Guard Authorization Act.

This critical measure, which Congress approves every 2 years, authorizes Coast Guard procurement programs, such as Coast Guard shipbuilding, which is so necessary in terms of carrying out the Coast Guard's mission both at home and overseas, and also makes prudent adjustments to shoreside infrastructure, including the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, which is located in my district in New London, Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in 2023, the press discovered that there was an investigation that the Coast Guard internally conducted over a number of years, tracking and identifying an unacceptable and really outrageous amount of sexual harassment and even sexual abuse that was happening on the campus. The report, which the new Commandant, Admiral Fagan, did release publicly, describes a totally unacceptable situation, which this Coast Guard authorization bill does address.

Specifically, the bill includes H.R. 5249, the Coast Guard Academy Safe-to-

Report Parity Act, which I introduced with a bipartisan coalition, that requires the Coast Guard to prescribe a safe-to-report policy to protect personnel who report incidents of sexual assault or sexual harassment from being punished for minor offenses, which may hinder them reporting acts which they were victims of.

In February of this year, the Commandant, Admiral Fagan, directed the Coast Guard to establish this policy through administrative action. Our bill, which we passed last night, will actually codify the policy and make it part of the Federal U.S. Code and bring parity for the Coast Guard with the Department of Defense and its service academies, which have had this law in effect for the last 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, many victims of sexual assault hesitated to report because they feared repercussions for minor collateral misconduct. In fact, a recent Coast Guard workplace gender relations survey found that 25 percent of the female victims who chose not to report their sexual assaults were concerned that they might get in trouble for something else that they did.

This bill will firmly and finally eliminate a barrier to reporting sexual assault and harassment, taking fear of repercussions off the table.

Again, I thank Admiral Lisa Fagan for her outstanding leadership and for working diligently with me, my office, and other Members of Congress to craft this crucial policy. I also thank Chairs GRAVES and WEBSTER and Ranking Members LARSEN and CARBAJAL for their work in passing the Coast Guard authorization out of committee and bringing it to the floor last night for a successful vote.

Again, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to quickly craft their version of the bill and make sure that we codify these protections for outstanding young cadets who are going to be the future leaders of the Coast Guard for decades and decades to come.

BACK THE BLUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week. It is a time to recognize and thank our police and law enforcement officers for risking their lives to protect our families.

These heroes work long hours and make incredible sacrifices to keep our communities safe, never seeking recognition or praise for what they do. We cannot thank them enough for their service to our country.

Today, we also honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty, including Algona Police Officer Kevin Cram and those who sadly passed away due to medical complications, such as Iowa State Trooper Rose Hoyt Ives, who was based in Council Bluffs for years. Our prayers remain with their families and loved ones.

In Congress, I will continue to stand with our law enforcement community and back those in blue. They deserve our deepest appreciation in all that they do.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, during National Hospital Week, I recognize our incredible hospitals in Iowa and thank our doctors, nurses, healthcare workers, and administrators who keep our hospitals running each and every day. Their work is critical in keeping our families and communities safe and healthy.

On my 36-county tour, I met with healthcare workers and families about the importance of keeping our hospitals open and operational in our rural communities. That is why I introduced the Rural Hospital Stabilization Act, which just passed out of Ways and Means Committee, to help our hospitals meet payroll, retain quality staff, make needed improvements, and deliver exceptional care.

As a past city administrator, I can fully say that when a rural hospital closes, it is truly devastating to the community and to Iowa as a whole.

Fortunately, this bill will deliver the financial support that our hospitals need to provide high-quality healthcare to our families.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I will continue to advocate for policies that keep our rural hospitals strong and vibrant and protect access to affordable, reliable healthcare in Iowa.

Again, I thank all of our healthcare workers for creating true quality care in Iowa.

RECOGNIZING DORDT UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, Dordt University women's basketball won the 2024 NAIA Women's Basketball National Championship.

Led by Head Coach Bill Harmsen, the Defenders defeated the University of Providence by a score of 57-53 to secure their first-ever national championship. With this championship victory, the Defenders finished the season with a nine-game winning streak and ended with a program-best 35-2 record. This is an incredible milestone in the history of this program.

I thank the head coach and the girls' basketball team for their hard work, dedication, and sportsmanship that has elevated Dordt's women's basketball team on the national stage.

I congratulate women's basketball Coach Bill Harmsen on a successful season and look forward to cheering him on in the Defenders' 2025 and 2026 seasons.

HONORING DISTINGUISHED SHERIFFS OF GEORGIA'S 10TH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during this National Police Week to honor four Georgia sheriffs. Sheriffs Janis Mangum, Melvin Andrews, Robert Markley, and Joe Chapman are each distinguished officers from Georgia's 10th District, who, after a career of serving others, are retiring later this year.

Our law enforcement officers and first responders risk their lives every time they don their uniforms.

Mr. Speaker, in a time of the defund the police movement out there from the left, it is more important than ever that we back our men and women in blue.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I join millions of Americans out there in expressing my gratitude to every law enforcement officer during this National Police Week for their service, dedication, and courage. I also thank Sheriffs Mangum, Andrews, Markley, and Chapman on behalf of Georgia's 10th District.

SERGEANT DENNIS MILLS VETERAN OF THE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor an extraordinary individual, Sergeant Dennis Mills, as our Veteran of the Month.

Drafted into the U.S. Marine Corps at the age of 20, Sergeant Mills exemplified bravery and dedication in some of the most difficult conditions imaginable during the Vietnam war. Assigned to the First Reconnaissance Battalion of the 1st Marine Division, he led approximately 40 reconnaissance patrols.

On a day that started as a beautiful morning on April 1, 1970, at Camp Reasoner, tragedy struck when a member of his patrol triggered a landmine.

Despite sustaining severe injuries, Sergeant Mills' courage never wavered. He was medically evacuated after suffering injuries to both legs, his left arm, and receiving shrapnel wounds to his back.

For his valor, Sergeant Mills was awarded the Navy Commendation Medal with Combat "V" and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sergeant Dennis Mills for his service and his sacrifice for our great Nation. He is a true hero.

SMALL BUSINESS OF THE MONTH, ENERGY TRANSPORT SOLUTIONS

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the Fourth District of Missouri's May Small Business of the Month, Energy Transport Solutions.

ETS is a customer service-focused business. It is run by an industry-experienced family that is proud to have an excellent safety record while getting the job done in Missouri. Energy Transport Solutions has been owned and operated by a father and son duo,

Glen and Eric Kolkmeier, in Bates City, Missouri, since 1955.

ETS specializes in transportation of refined fuels, propane, jet and aviation fuel, and anhydrous ammonia. ETS has been in the propane industry for over 68 years and has continued to be a reliable company to haul our community's products. By the way, they also haul the fuel for the B-2 Stealth bomber at Whiteman Air Force Base.

We are so grateful for Energy Transport Solutions' support as we continue to support them. It is an honor to watch them go out of their way to hire and support veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Energy Transport Solutions on the well-deserved recognition of Small Business of the Month in the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Missouri. Keep up the great work.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S ULTIMATUM TO ISRAEL

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern over the President's ultimatum to the State of Israel.

Having recently visited Israel on the border with Gaza, I fully grasp the gravity of the situation right now. I witnessed the resolve of the Jewish people. Never have I seen such determination from a country and its people as I have there in the State of Israel. Their resolve is strong. They are resilient and ready to finish the job, bring the hostages home, and eradicate Hamas.

The White House's decision to halt weapons shipments to Israel is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is just plain wrong. When the going gets tough, you do not abandon friends and allies. They are our greatest ally in the Middle East.

It is unacceptable that Hamas still holds Americans and others hostage. This could be over today, Mr. Speaker, if Hamas would release the hostages and surrender. We must help Israel eradicate Hamas. We must remove them from that region by any force necessary.

I call on the President of the United States and Secretary of Defense Austin to immediately lift the blockade and resume shipments to Israel. The future of the region depends upon it.

There is no excuse for pausing the weapons. It is an attempt to strong-arm Israel. The Biden administration has crossed the line.

Mr. Speaker, I can say with certainty that while the Biden administration does not stand with Israel, the American people do.

ALLEGHANY HIGHLANDS PUBLIC SCHOOL 2024 EMPLOYEE HALL OF FAME CLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor an extraordinary group of educators and staff whose dedication has profoundly impacted the Alleghany Highlands com-

munity. This group was selected as the seven inaugural inductees into the Alleghany Highlands Public Schools Division Employee Hall of Fame.

This distinguished class, announced on May 9, symbolizes the unwavering commitment to excellence that defines our educators in Virginia's Sixth District. These individuals: Helen Harris, Brenda Holloway, Harold Lambert, the late Katharine Nicely, Donna Vaughn, Archie Wells, and Linda Williams, have each dedicated over 20 years of their lives fostering a nurturing environment for learning within the Alleghany County, Covington City, and Clifton Forge school divisions.

Their roles range from teachers of English, French, science, and art to counselors, coaches, and even a beloved custodian.

Each, in their unique way, has contributed significantly to the educational fabric of our community, guiding countless students toward achieving their full potential. Their legacy, now forever enshrined in the Alleghany Highlands Public Schools Division Employee Hall of Fame, reminds us all of the transformative power of education.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all of them on this well-deserved honor and I thank them for their significant contributions to education in the Commonwealth and Alleghany Highlands.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SHENANDOAH VALLEY TRAVEL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate an incredible milestone, the 100th anniversary of the Shenandoah Valley Travel Association, one of the oldest tourism organizations in the region.

Founded in 1924, the SVTA has played a pivotal role in showcasing the Shenandoah Valley's unparalleled beauty, cultural richness, and historic legacy.

Through collaboration with local businesses and national parks, the SVTA has consistently highlighted what makes the Shenandoah Valley special.

In honoring the SVTA's 100th anniversary, we recognize the profound impact that dedicated organizations and individuals can have in promoting the unique beauty and history of the Shenandoah Valley. Their efforts enrich our Commonwealth and indeed our country.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the Shenandoah Valley Travel Association on this significant anniversary and wish them another 100 years of success.

RECOGNIZING HELEN ZEBARTH OF BLUE RIDGE HOSPICE

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor a remarkable individual from Virginia's Sixth District, Helen Zebarth of Winchester, and her monumental legacy. She changed the face of end-of-life care in our community through the founding of Blue Ridge Hospice.

In recognition of her incredible impact, the Helen Zebarth Legacy Soci-

ety was established, symbolizing our community's ongoing commitment to support the mission of this noble organization.

Helen was inspired to establish the hospice here in Winchester after her experiences in England, demonstrating her foresight and dedication to serving others. It is awe-inspiring to witness how her vision of providing compassionate care at life's end has grown from serving 30 patients in 1974 to over 10,000 by 2014, with the numbers continuing to increase.

By acknowledging the substantial impact of Helen Zebarth and Blue Ridge Hospice on our community, we are all encouraged to support such essential organizations. Their work not only enriches our community, but also offers comfort to families during their most difficult times, exemplifying the utmost in human kindness and unity.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Helen Zebarth for her many years of success and for founding an organization that continues to shine as a beacon of hope and care in our cherished community.

CELEBRATING JACKSON RIVER TECHNICAL CENTER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hub of education and workforce development in the Alleghany Highlands, the Jackson River Technical Center, as it celebrates 50 years of outstanding service to our community.

Established in 1974 as the Jackson River Vocational Center, JRTC has since flourished into a beacon of opportunity and growth, playing a pivotal role in the education landscape of the Alleghany Highlands Public Schools.

Over the years, JRTC has evolved to meet the changing demands of the workforce, offering a broad spectrum of programs that include automotive, building management, carpentry, culinary arts, drafting and design, early childhood education, electricity, marketing, nurse aide/health assistant, and welding.

Through these programs, JRTC ensures that our students are not just prepared for the jobs of today but are also poised to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those educators, staff, and students, past and present, for their dedication and hard work. Their efforts have made JRTC a symbol of success in our community for 50 years. May they continue to inspire, educate, and empower for many more years to come.

HONORING AMERICA'S POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week marks National Police Week, a time dedicated to honoring America's courageous police officers who stand on the front lines to ensure our safety.

While certain voices on the left have demonized our police officers these past several years, it is important that we recognize and remember the profound sacrifices these men and women make protecting our communities every day.

In light of this, we must rally behind the bills proposed this week aimed at bolstering our local law enforcement and unequivocally denounce the left's effort to defund and dismantle our local police departments.

It is alarming that President Biden and many on the left support this defund the police movement and the soft-on-crime policies that have directly fueled surges in crime across the country, endangering both the public and the police.

Since 1776, over 26,600 police officers have lost their lives in the line of duty. In Virginia alone, 550 have made the ultimate sacrifice. These represent individual lives, families left heartbroken, and communities forever changed.

Mr. Speaker, as we honor National Police Week, I urge all my colleagues to join us in support by passing these bills.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CLINE) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, You are our refuge and our strength, a very present help in times of trouble. As evidence of Your divine protections, You have set among us brave men and women as Your own shield around us to keep us from all harm. On this National Police Officers Memorial Day, we pray on behalf of these heroes.

Thank You for the humble dedication that our brothers and sisters in blue have demonstrated on patrol, standing watch, guarding our streets, and walking our neighborhoods, safeguarding our communities and our country against all those who would shatter the peace You desire for us.

Remind us, O Lord, that the security they have committed themselves to uphold comes at their own personal cost. Aside from the countless missions that place each law enforcement officer at uncertain and inconceivable risk, these men and women are all too often called to put their service over self and the welfare of others before the preservation of their own life and limb.

As communities across the country honor the line-of-duty deaths they have sustained this year and over time, make it our duty never to take lightly

the weight of their faithful and sacrificial service. Speak comfort to the families of the fallen and all who have also paid the untold price for our peace and safety.

Keep watch over the lives of all police officers. As You have promised, watch over their coming and going, now and forevermore.

In the strength of Your name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. DAVIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

NONCITIZENS ALLOWED TO VOTE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, shockingly, some cities in America now allow noncitizens to vote, including in Ohio, but Republicans in that State, led by Secretary of State Frank LaRose, support only American citizens voting.

Election integrity with voter ID in person is crucial for democracy. House Republicans continue to work hard to protect Americans and strengthen our borders, not give illegal aliens the right to vote.

Every day, we have corrupt Judge Merchan, through incompetence and unprofessionalism, pave the way to reelect President Donald Trump.

The Democratic New York Times reports record support for Donald Trump by Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics due to Merchan judicial abuse, which they recognize. I so appreciate corrupt Judge Merchan reelecting Trump that I will invite him to be my guest at the Trump inauguration.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America with Biden's open borders for terrorists from dictator countries. It is sadly clear there are more 9/11 attacks across America imminent, as warned by the FBI.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as working families try to get ahead, billionaire food companies and grocery giants continue to engage in excessive price gouging.

That is why I am joining my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN, to call them out.

We heard good news this morning. Grocery prices are flat thanks to a rebounding economy under the leadership of President Biden, but times are still tough and grocery prices are still stubbornly high.

Meanwhile, corporate CEOs are raking in profits and urging people to eat cereal for dinner and urging people to eat Doritos as a side dish to save money. It is absurd.

Corporations can no longer hide behind the guise of inflation. At various points in recent years, grocery price increases have outpaced inflation, with families paying 25 percent more for groceries as compared to pre-pandemic.

I applaud the Biden-Harris administration for the economic relief they have already delivered for working families. Now, we are putting billionaire corporations on notice. Their time of greed is coming to an end. We all need to work together to end hunger now.

USAF CUTS MUST INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNITY IMPACT

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we aren't going to stand idly by as the proposed 520 job cut at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base threatens to damage eastern North Carolina's economy.

The Air Force's plan to eliminate an entire squadron at Seymour Johnson is absolutely unacceptable. Safeguarding our national security and preserving these jobs are not mutually exclusive, and the Air Force must acknowledge that.

Eliminating a fighter squadron in Wayne County would be devastating for this already economically distressed community. Unfortunately, this plan does not build the economy from the middle out and bottom up.

The Air Force must thoroughly examine the risk and consider the community impact. I encourage the Air Force to engage directly with the local community.

The Air Force must be more transparent and accountable to the people of Wayne County, eastern North Carolina, and the Congress.

CALLING FOR RELEASE OF TYLER WENRICH

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call on Turks and Caicos to treat Louisa County resident Tyler Wenrich fairly and appropriately for his accidental mistake in their country.

Tyler is a paramedic and vice president of operations at Emergency Services Solutions in Powhatan County. On April 23, while traveling with friends in Turks and Caicos, law enforcement discovered two stray bullets in his baggage. Tyler apparently had the two bullets in his luggage when leaving the United States, but they were not discovered by our own TSA.

He is facing up to 12 years in prison despite no demonstrated criminal intent.

My staff and I remain in constant communication with Tyler and his family, providing support and advocating for his release with consequences that fit the unintentional offense.

I call on the Biden administration to join me in demanding his release and issuing a State Department travel advisory, warning travelers to Turks and Caicos of the excessive criminal penalties they may face there for accidental minor offenses.

Tyler's wife, Jeriann, and young son need him in Louisa, and my staff and I will continue to pursue every avenue to help facilitate his safe return.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to Section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431) and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term ending May 14, 2026:

Mrs. VICKY HARTZLER, Harrisonville, Missouri

Mrs. Maureen Ferguson, Potomac, Maryland

Mr. Asif Mahmood, Bradbury, California

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8369, ISRAEL SECURITY ASSISTANCE SUPPORT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7530, D.C. CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT OF 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7343, DETAIN AND DEPORT ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO ASSAULT COPS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8146, POLICE OUR BORDER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7581, IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT OF 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 354, LEOSA REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1213, RESOLUTION REGARDING VIOLENCE AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1210, CONDEMNING THE BIDEN BORDER CRISIS AND THE TREMENDOUS BURDENS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FACE AS A RESULT

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1227 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1227

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8369) to provide for the expeditious delivery of defense articles and defense services for Israel and other matters. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7530) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8146) to require a report by the Attorney General on the impact the border crisis is having on law enforcement at the Federal, State, local, and Tribal level. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part

B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7581) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 354) to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-34 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1213) a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the

resolution (H. Res. 1210) condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. House Resolution 1227 provides for consideration of eight measures: H.R. 8369, H.R. 7530, H.R. 7343, H.R. 8146, H.R. 7581, H.R. 354, H. Res. 1213, and H. Res. 1210. The rule provides for H.R. 7343 and H.R. 8146 to be considered under structured rules with 1 hour of debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of two measures, H.R. 354 and H.R. 7581, under closed rules with 1 hour of debate each, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H. Res. 1210 and H. Res. 1213 under closed rules, with 1 hour of debate each, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 7530 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8369 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their designee and provides for one motion to recommit.

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

The rule before us provides for consideration of three measures to support our Nation's law enforcement in the face of the Biden administration's disastrous immigration policies.

H.R. 7343, the Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act, would bring real consequences on the heads of those in our country illegally. This legislation would require the immediate detention and deportation of any illegal alien who chooses to assault the men and women who keep our communities safe.

Additionally, H.R. 8146 would require that the Attorney General provide a full accounting of how this historic and dangerous border crisis has truly impacted the health and the safety of our Nation's law enforcement.

Finally, H. Res. 1210 condemns the Biden administration's failed border policies that have resulted in 9.3 million illegal alien encounters along our borders in less than 4 years—and that doesn't include those that have evaded Border Patrol.

America's law enforcement officers are on the front lines of the Biden border crisis, bearing the brunt of this President's open-borders policies that are threatening the security of our Nation and laying waste to our communities.

We have yet to fully know the true damage done to our national security by 4 years of flinging the doors open for those breaking our laws. One thing is certain, it is falling on our Nation's law enforcement officers—our police officers in big cities and small towns across America—to contend with the consequences of this administration's open-borders policies.

The Biden border crisis is only one challenge facing our Nation's law enforcement officers. As we witness an alarming surge in criminal activity thanks to the left's antipolice, soft-on-crime policies, it is imperative that we confront a harsh reality. Our law enforcement officers are under attack both physically and politically. They are being targeted by the radical left simply for doing their jobs, for upholding the rule of law, and for protecting our communities.

To that end, the rule today before us provides for consideration of several measures that stand with our law enforcement officers in the face of these asinine policies that seek to vilify them and prevent them from doing their jobs, including H.R. 7581, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act; H.R. 354, the LEOSA Reform Act; and H. Res. 1213, a resolution condemning violence against our law enforcement officers.

H.R. 7581 would require the Department of Justice to report to Congress about violent attacks on law enforcement officers and the response of Federal, State, and local governments to these attacks.

Additionally, H.R. 354 would fix a discrepancy under current law to ensure that qualified active or retired law enforcement officers are not prohibited from carrying a concealed firearm in public settings. There is no good reason why the men and women who put their lives on the line for us every day should have their Second Amendment rights curtailed as they are under the current law.

Finally, H. Res. 1213 expresses a sentiment that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can fully embrace and get behind: full, unequivocal support for our law enforcement officers and strong opposition to any movement that seeks to defund the police.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of statistics or headlines. The soft-on-crime policies that the radical left have championed have only left American families in more danger. Years of Democrat-elected officials, including some right here in Congress, calling to defund the police have vilified our law enforcement officers, preventing them from doing their jobs, leaving the people that they serve less safe.

Nowhere is this displayed more vividly than right here in our Nation's Capital, and the rule before us today also provides for consideration of a bill to combat the District of Columbia's anti-law enforcement, pro-criminal policies: H.R. 7530, the D.C. Criminal Reforms to Immediately Make Everyone Safe Act.

D.C. law enforcement remains understaffed and overwhelmed by soaring rates of violent crime. In 2023 alone, homicides increased 29 percent from 2022, violent crime increased 37 percent, and robberies increased 65 percent.

What has the D.C. Council done?

Well, in 2022, it passed the Revised Criminal Code Act, which reduced penalties for violent offenders, and in that same year the Council passed the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act, which targeted D.C. Metropolitan Police Department officers and their ability to combat rising crime.

If the D.C. Council will not heed the concerns of the District's residents, police officers, and visitors from this country and around the world, then it is Congress' job to step in. This mess only encourages lawlessness and puts lives at risk. We have had one of our own colleagues, a Member of Congress, carjacked and a staffer stabbed, among many other horrifying and violent crimes. If we can't get a handle on crime in our Nation's beautiful Capital, how does that fare for the rest of the country?

H.R. 7530 changes the maximum age limit for youth offender status from 24 years old to 18 years old. It requires the District's attorney general to establish and update a public website containing juvenile crime statistics in the District and prohibits the D.C. Council from enacting any changes to criminal sentences.

Youth criminal activity has skyrocketed along with every other manner of violent crime in our Nation's Capital. A soft-on-crime approach is simply just not working, putting the lives of innocent residents and visitors in danger, and hamstringing the ability of our cops to do their jobs.

Residents of D.C. have the same rights as other Americans to be secure in their homes and to be protected against crimes committed against their lives and their property. It is heartbreaking to see the crimes committed by children and young people in D.C., and we need real solutions to address them. Children in our Nation's Capital deserve better than antipolice policies that lead them to a life of crime.

It is our duty as Members of Congress, as laid out in the D.C. Home Rule Act, to step in when the District's own policies so clearly threaten the safety of the residents of our Nation's Capital as they do today.

Finally, the rule before us provides for consideration of H.R. 8369, the Israel Security Assistance Support Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is frankly shocking and disgusting to hear that President Biden is purposely withholding our Nation's arms shipments to Israel as they are fighting to defend their right to exist.

At a time when Israel is under assault, facing attacks from Hamas and Iran, the decision to withhold these critical munitions is not just a failure; it is a betrayal of our greatest ally in the Middle East, and it goes directly against the will of this Congress and the will of the people.

We cannot let political games endanger lives. H.R. 8369 would ensure that America stands with Israel in its darkest hour, despite this administration's disgraceful actions to block such vital support. The legislation will ensure that any defense articles and defense services for Israel are delivered expeditiously, without obstruction from an administration that is willing to play games, unfortunately, with such necessary shipments, and we will prevent them subverting the will of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, America must stand with Israel and send a message to the world that we will not falter. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have us here today considering eight measures that aren't worth the paper they are printed on. Six of the eight measures that are being brought before this House are being brought forth under completely closed rules, which means nobody, not Democrats and not Republicans, can offer any amendments to change or improve those bills.

So much for Republican promises of a more deliberative process or more openness or more fairness. That just went out the window.

I don't think I have ever seen a group of people do so much and yet accomplish so little.

Seven of these measures are supposedly about law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, do you know how many of them will actually do something to help keep people safe?

Zero. Zilch. Nada.

Just a piece of free advice to my Republican friends: It is probably not the best idea to take direction on law and order from a guy who, as we speak, is a defendant for covering up hush money payments to a porn star for political gain. That is not even to mention the other three criminal felony prosecutions that he faces.

Look at the cover of today's New York Times, Madam Speaker. This is unbelievable. Here is a picture of the Speaker of this House of Representatives, second in line to the Presidency, standing in front of a courthouse acting as a prop for Donald Trump trying to interfere with a criminal trial because, apparently, Republicans like law and order unless it applies to them.

It is unbelievable. Madam Speaker, you can't make this stuff up.

I will say to my colleagues that this stunt of the Speaker and Republican Members of Congress going to this courthouse diminishes this House of Representatives. Their candidate for President has been indicted more times than he has been elected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of President.

Mr. McGOVERN. I didn't think I was.

Somehow, Madam Speaker, they have the nerve to tell us about the criminal justice system?

Give me a break.

Their credibility on this issue has evaporated. It is pathetic. I could go through these bills one by one, but I think the American people would rather watch paint dry because none of these bills do anything. None of these bills will be passed by the Senate. None of them will do a damn thing to help the police. None of them will keep our communities safe. We have a ton of BS bills going out to immigrants. Let me just remind everyone: It was Republicans who killed their own bipartisan border security bill in the Senate, and it is Republicans in the House who refused to even bring it up for a vote.

Why?

It is because they are afraid it might pass. They are afraid they might lose a talking point.

We have a nonbinding resolution about defund the police.

Isn't it ironic that they all talk so much about defunding the police, but despite their rhetoric, Republicans are the ones who want to defund the police.

Republicans support cutting the COPS program, which hires police officers in every State in America.

Get this, Madam Speaker: Republicans voted against awarding police officers who protected all of us on January 6 the Congressional Gold Medal. Let that sink in.

Republicans voted to fire 2,000 Customs and Border Protection police officers. Republicans voted to cut Federal support for local law enforcement agencies in September of 2022.

Republicans have called to abolish the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the ATF.

At every single juncture, when Republicans have had a chance to put their money where their mouth is, they have shown that all their pro-police rhetoric is just that: rhetoric.

They will say whatever they need to win political support from police and then hope the cops don't notice when they vote to cut their budgets.

The eighth bill this rule would bring to the floor is the so-called Israel Security Assistance Support Act. This bill is a disaster. It basically gets rid of human rights checks and balances already in place on arms transfers, and it would interfere with any administration's ability to comply with U.S. obligations under international human rights and humanitarian law.

I think it is absurd that my Republican friends don't understand the difference between supporting Israel and writing Prime Minister Netanyahu a blank check to do whatever the hell he wants with U.S. weapons with no regard for civilian lives or for human rights.

That is not even just the Democratic position, by the way. Three U.S. Presidents have threatened to pause military aid to Israel under similar circumstances.

Who were they?

They were Dwight Eisenhower, Ronald Reagan, and George H.W. Bush. They were all Republicans, Madam Speaker. They were all Republicans.

Please don't give me this partisan BS. Please. Please, spare us that.

U.S. military assistance doesn't come with no conditions. If our taxpayers are paying for it, then they ought to have some level of assurance that it is not being used to indiscriminately bomb civilians or block the delivery of humanitarian aid to starving people.

The bombs that the President is withholding, these 2-ton bombs, have a blast radius of one-quarter of a mile. That means, I would say to my friends, if you were standing in front of this Capitol and the bomb were dropped on the Republican congressional campaign headquarters or the Democratic congressional campaign headquarters, then we all would be dead if we were standing in front of the U.S. Capitol.

The President is concerned that 2-ton bombs are being dropped on Rafah, a heavily populated area with over 1 million people. He believes that the civilian casualties are unacceptable. We all should care about the civilian casualties, especially if we claim to be a friend of Israel, because the more civil-

ian casualties that are incurred, then the more difficulty Israel has in getting to a lasting peace.

It is a real shame that this is what Republicans have decided we should spend our week doing, Madam Speaker. I had hoped, Madam Speaker, that after the Democrats bailed out Speaker MIKE JOHNSON last week that maybe, just maybe, we would see a change in the tone of this place. Maybe there would be more of an acknowledgment that we need to put people over politics and that we need to get stuff done, because that is what the American people want.

I am disappointed to see that this week it is just more of the same old same old from this incompetent Republican leadership that has wasted away their time and power and accomplished nothing, not a single damn thing, during their time in their slim majority. The American people deserve a hell of a lot better than they are getting from my friends on the Republican side.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleague on the other side of the aisle likes to talk about the fact that these bills today that we are going to consider this week, these pro-police measures, don't have a future in the Senate or getting to the desk of the President. Yes, that is because his party controls those two branches. The Senate leadership will do nothing with this because they don't support the underlying legislation. They don't support law enforcement.

I would like to point out that it was Democrats who have for years pushed the defund the police rhetoric in cities, States, and right here in Washington, not House Republicans. In fact, it was Democrats who took the defund the police rhetoric and made it viral. They turned it into concrete policy that demonizes our men and women in blue while letting violent criminals back out on the street.

Madam Speaker, do you think the American people are really going to buy that Democrats weren't the ones who wanted to defund the police?

Madam Speaker, we could rewind the tape back to 2020 if you want to. We can show you the footage of our cities burning while they were chanting to defund the police and watching weak mayors of cities down on one knee begging for forgiveness for standing for law and order. We could go back and rewind the tape and get a little instant replay if you like. The footage is there. It is in black and white. It is a matter of historical fact that my friend's party supported the defund the police movement.

What I just heard from the other side of the aisle couldn't be any more laughable. Democrats in New York City, certainly not Republicans, cut the NYPD's budget by \$1 billion with more cuts to come. We have some of

those brave NYPD officers here with us this week for Police Week.

Democrats in Los Angeles, not Republicans, cut the LAPD's budget by hundreds of millions of dollars with more cuts to come.

Democrats in Chicago, not Republicans, cut the Chicago PD's budget by \$1 billion only to embarrassingly and quietly reverse further plans for cuts in recent years after crime spiraled out of control.

Right here in our Nation's Capital it was Democrats, not Republicans, who passed legislation to make it more difficult than ever for cops to do their jobs and keep D.C.'s communities and residents safe. Let's not forget that at the height of the defund the police movement, it was House Democrats, not House Republicans, who attempted to completely defund the Department of Justice's Project Safe Neighborhoods program, a nationwide initiative that empowers law enforcement to work with community leaders and stakeholders to directly identify the most pressing violent crime problems in a community. I am talking rapes, armed robberies, gang violence, and much, much more.

Nonetheless, that didn't stop House Democrats from defunding this program to appease a radical base. The radical left has bought hook, line, and sinker into the defund the police movement, and Americans in New York, in Washington, in Chicago, in L.A., and everywhere else where Democrat leaders hold sway are reaping the consequences of these dangerous policies.

Madam Speaker, the family of slain NYPD Officer Jonathan Diller told New York Governor Kathy Hochul that she had blood on her hands. They see, as Americans across the country see, that it is the Democrats and not the Republicans who have abandoned law enforcement. They have vilified them, and they have made it harder than ever for them to do their job and keep their people safe.

The legislation under this rule today is a step in the direction of supporting our law enforcement officers and empowering them with the tools to keep our communities safe in spite of the defund the police movement and in spite of the Biden border crisis.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding, and I thank him for leading this discussion on behalf of the Rules Committee today.

I wanted to come down and speak in support of the rule, and I want to speak in support of the underlying bills.

We do honor National Police Week. Republicans are advancing seven pieces of legislation to reaffirm their commitment to our Nation's law enforcement. Yet, again, we are seeing our colleagues misrepresenting the legislation that really should be bipartisan.

Every single day, Madam Speaker, thousands of men and women in blue put their lives on the line to protect their communities and keep We the People safe.

Last year, in fact, more than 370 law enforcement officers were shot in the line of duty, the highest year on record.

Law enforcement officers and their departments are under increased scrutiny from the public, all the while trying to navigate a crisis at our southern border, a historic upsurge in crime, and an unfortunate rise in drug-related deaths throughout the country.

It is no surprise then, Madam Speaker, that the police departments across the country have had trouble recruiting and retaining officers and keeping new officer candidates.

This week, started by President Kennedy in 1962, is set aside to commemorate and honor all of the officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty. I am grateful to north Texas law enforcement officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice this year and for those who are currently serving.

In honor of this week, I encourage everyone to reach out and thank their local law enforcement officers and their families for their service and for their sacrifice.

Madam Speaker, I also wanted to express my support for the Israel Security Assistance Support Act. Amid the Biden administration's pause on munitions shipments to Israel, it is imperative for the United States, for this House, and for Republicans and Democrats, to stand behind Israel.

Last week, President Biden and his administration paused vital defense articles from shipment to Israel. This action will have the effect of not only prolonging the conflict, but it is an unfortunate disregard of the legislative process of our powers granted under Article I of the Constitution. The idea that the President can ignore bipartisan, bicameral legislation that he signed into law is a new predicament entirely.

H.R. 8369 provides for the assured timely delivery of defense services and articles to Israel and condemns the Biden administration for their efforts to condition aid to an ally.

□ 1245

After the withdrawal from Afghanistan, Madam Speaker, maintaining our commitment to a formal ally is extremely necessary and important. Israel is defending itself against a regional threat. It is defending itself against a known terrorist organization, one that hides behind its own people.

Israel must have the resources it needs to combat Hamas and any other entity that seeks to destroy civil rights and civil liberties.

It is for this reason that the United States will continue to stand by our allies in their time of need.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support the underlying bill, and I urge support for the rule.

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

Madam Speaker, it is rich to be lectured by the chairman of the Rules Committee about the need to support our police officers and to help do more to recruit and train them.

I will say to my friend, the distinguished Member from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), and to all of my Republican friends: Stop cutting COPS grants. Continue to adequately fund the COPS program so that we can actually have our local law enforcement recruit and hire more police officers.

My Republican friends don't like to admit a desire to cut the COPS grants. I would say to everybody who is watching to look it up for themselves.

The Republican Study Committee, which is the largest caucus in the Republican Conference, actually put out a report titled: "Fiscal Sanity to Save America." If my colleagues go to page 148, and I urge people to look it up for themselves, it says: "Reduce funding for Community Oriented Policing Services," or basically what we call the COPS grants.

Republicans want to cut money for our local police. It is in their budget document. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to cut the money and then come here and make believe somehow that Republicans support our local police officers. Come on. Enough.

Additionally, sometimes I wonder whether the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) really believes the stuff that he says. The gentleman keeps talking about crime in Democrat-run cities. By the way, it is Democratic-run cities. The last time I checked, we don't have Democratic cities or Republican cities in this country. We have American cities.

I took the liberty of looking up some of the headlines from New York's 23rd Congressional District, which Mr. LANGWORTHY represents, and, in particular, Jamestown, New York, the largest city in the area and the location of his district office. Jamestown has a Republican mayor, a Republican city council, a Republican supermajority on the county legislature, a Republican State representative, a Republican State senator, and a Republican Congressman.

Let's look at some of the recent headlines from the Republican stronghold of Jamestown, New York: April 22, 2024, "Jamestown man accused of killing 16-month-old child charged with manslaughter"; March 2024, "1 dead, 2 injured in Jamestown homicide"; January 2024, "Investigation Underway in Jamestown Homicide Case"; May 2023, "Three Accused Of Stealing A Vehicle In Jamestown"; June 2021, "Two teenage girls charged with arson in connection with Jamestown furniture manufacturer fire"; and February 2024, "Six arrested after robbery, assault leads to standoff in Jamestown NY."

I could go on and on. Madam Speaker, none of this is to disparage the won-

derful people who Mr. LANGWORTHY represents, but if the gentleman wants to come down here and read off RNC talking points about crime, I think the gentleman should at least try to be intellectually honest.

I know the other side wants to play the blame game. I know Republicans are all about stunts and not solutions, but maybe, just maybe, the majority ought to look in the mirror first instead of playing to the cheap seats.

Madam Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Salon article titled: "Republicans like to talk tough on crime—but they're the ones with a real crime problem."

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

There was no objection.

[From salon, Feb. 15, 2023]

REPUBLICANS LIKE TO TALK TOUGH ON CRIME—BUT THEY'RE THE ONES WITH A REAL CRIME PROBLEM

(By Austin Sarat)

Republicans like to talk tough about crime. But they have a crime problem of their own that they want to keep under wraps.

A new study of homicide by the non-partisan advocacy group Third Way reveals a fact that Republicans don't want to acknowledge. Rates of violent crime, especially murder rates, are higher in red states than in blue states.

That has been true for years, yet Democrats have said almost nothing about this startling fact or about Republicans' evident incompetence in actually doing something about crime.

Crime is an American problem, touching the lives of people in cities, suburbs and rural areas. Yet for all its talk about crime, the Republican Party has not delivered an effective strategy to fight it.

Of course, you would never know that from listening to Republican politicians or the public officials who represent red states. They take every opportunity to try to convince voters that crime is a problem made worse by "liberal" policies, and that it runs rampant in cities and states where Democrats are in charge.

Consider the charges in an op-ed written by House Republican Whip Steve Scalise, R-La., and Rep. Scott Fitzgerald, R-Wis., for the Fox News site in the run-up to the 2022 election.

"Over the last few years," they wrote, "we have seen the consequences of leftist Democrats' embrace of the radical 'Defund the Police' and 'No Cash Bail' movements. By slashing police budgets, ending cash bail, and allowing violent offenders back onto our streets, radical Democrats nationwide have made our communities less safe."

Violent crime, they said, was out of control in "every Democrat-run city and state across the country."

Echoing Scalise and Fitzgerald, Kevin McCarthy, the recently installed Republican speaker of the House, bluntly claimed that "Democrat politicians defended police, raised money for rioters, and pushed policies that are soft on crime. They own this crime wave."

Looking back at the 2022 midterm elections, CNN reported that "Over the first three weeks of October (2022), GOP candidates and committees spent \$64.5 million on ads focused on crime—nearly one-quarter of all the money they spent on ads over that period. . . . Many of those ads accused

Democrats of supporting the ending of cash bail or efforts to defund the police.”

Wisconsin Sen. Ron Johnson’s re-election campaign provides one example of this attempt to pin the soft-on-crime label on Democrats. Johnson ran a series of ads attacking his Democratic opponent, Mandela Barnes, for advocating an end to cash bail.

The ads ended with the tagline, “Mandela Barnes, not Just a Democrat, but a dangerous Democrat” and a racially charged image of Barnes superimposed over a picture of several Democratic women of color who serve in the House of Representatives and are known as the “Squad.” Johnson wound up winning that race by an exceedingly narrow margin, just 26,000 votes out of more than 2.6 million cast.

Not surprisingly, a 2022 Gallup Poll found that “partisanship plays a significant role in shaping Americans’ assessments of crime.”

Gallup reports that “since 2000, supporters of the president’s party have typically been less likely than those who identify with the opposition party to say that crime has increased. Before that, during both George H.W. Bush’s and Bill Clinton’s presidencies, partisans held similar perceptions of the crime problem.”

Gallup also found that “Last October, with Joe Biden in the White House and after the FBI released its 2020 crime statistics showing a sharp increase in murders in the U.S., the percentage of Republicans who said there was more local crime increased from 38% to 67%. Independents’ perception that local crime was worse also edged up, while Democrats’ view was essentially unchanged.”

But Republicans’ hypocritical exploitation of the crime issue isn’t just an election-year phenomenon.

Last month they went on the attack when Washington, D.C.’s Democratic City Council overrode Mayor Muriel Bowser’s veto of the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022. The city ordinance modernized the District’s criminal laws, which had not been overhauled for more than 100 years.

It was designed to “expand eligibility for the Second Look Act from youthful, convicted violent offenders to people of all ages; . . . expand the right to a Jury trial for those charged with misdemeanors but facing jail time; and. . . reduce maximum criminal penalties for violent crimes like carjacking and robberies.”

Republicans quickly pounced, using the accusation that Democrats are soft on crime in a successful effort to get the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional authority to override the D.C. law.

Americans’ perception of crime is now a partisan issue, driven by which party holds power. But Republicans’ hypocritical exploitation of crime is no longer just an election-year phenomenon.

One local news story quotes Rep. James Comer, R-Ky, chair of the House Oversight and Accountability Committee, as saying that, “There’s a crime crisis in America’s capital city. According to the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, carjackings in the District have increased by 90% compared to this time last year. Total property crime is up 31%, and homicides are up 29%.”

But, following the usual Republican playbook, Comer wasn’t content to recite those facts.

“The radical D.C. Council,” he continued “has chosen to prioritize legislation that will turn this crime crisis into a catastrophe. The D.C. Council’s progressive soft-on-crime legislation eliminates almost all the mandatory minimum sentencing requirements for violent crimes, and it drastically reduces the maximum penalties allowable to the courts.”

While Republicans talk about the crime rate in Democratic run cities like Wash-

ington, they won’t own up to their own problems in dealing with crime. These problems were highlighted in a 2022 Los Angeles Magazine article which pointed out that murder rates in “mid-sized cities with Republican mayors have actually fared far worse than big cities with Democratic mayors.”

For example, the homicide rate in Bakersfield, California—the principal city in Kevin McCarthy’s district—was more than twice as high as that of San Francisco, represented in the house by former Speaker Nancy Pelosi.

This brings us back to the Third Way report, which points out that what is true in California is true across the nation. The report meticulously documents the Republicans’ hidden crime problem.

“The murder rate in Trump-voting states,” the Third Way report says, “has exceeded the murder rate in Biden-voting states every year this century. Cumulatively, overall murder rates since 2000 were on average 23% higher in Trump-voting states.” It continues:

For the past 21 years, the top 10 murder rate states have been dominated by reliably red states, namely Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Missouri. And when we removed the county with the largest city in Trump-voting states (and kept them in for Biden-voting states), murder rates were still significantly higher in these red states.

While media reports give the impression that murder rates are skyrocketing in blue areas, murder rates have actually increased at far higher rates in Trump-voting states over the past two decades, widening the Red State murder gap from a low of 9% in 2003 and 2004 to a high of 44% in 2019, before falling to 43% in 2020. Since 2000, murder rates have increased 39.4% in red states and just 13.4% in blue states.

It’s time for Democrats to make these facts known, and stop giving Republicans a free pass on the crime issue. They need to expose Republican cynicism, hypocrisy and incompetence in dealing with crime—and remind voters of these failings at every opportunity.

As Jim Kessler, Third Way’s executive VP for policy puts it, “Republicans seem to do a much better job of talking about stopping crime than actually stopping crime.”

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

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

Madam Speaker, it is great to see that my colleague, the ranking member, has looked into Jamestown, New York, and read some of our headlines. Yes, we have Republican leadership right now, a brand-new elected Republican mayor. There was a Democratic mayor up until this last election, but I don’t blame the outgoing Democratic mayor.

I do blame the State of New York’s leadership for destroying the criminal justice system in the State of New York, eliminating cash bail, and creating discovery reform. Creating a revolving-door criminal justice system in the State of New York is the reason that the police officers, many of which are at our Capitol this very week to celebrate Police Week, can’t do their jobs.

They have been put in handcuffs while the criminals walk free with an appearance ticket for many of the same crimes that the gentleman just rattled off from the Jamestown Post-

Journal. That is fact. That is fact in the State of New York because Democrat-run policies, a Democratic Governor, a supermajority in the State senate, and a supermajority in the State assembly have destroyed my State’s criminal justice system. They have blood on their hands and have destroyed towns, villages, and cities across the once-great Empire State.

The gentleman has found a few headlines, and we hope to get some restoration of common sense back to the Empire State once again, but it has to start right here in our Nation’s Capital. It starts with the legislation under this rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), my friend.

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, a couple of days ago, the former Democratic majority leader of this body called out the radicals in his own party who are reflecting the talking points and rhetoric of Hamas, which, of course, wishes for the destruction of the State of Israel.

Unfortunately, it now seems that these radical elements have won out in terms of influencing policy in the White House and, as the former majority leader of Democrats in this House stated, in terms of getting their views that reflect the views of Hamas to become official policy of the White House.

The President’s recent statements suggesting that he will withhold vital security assistance for Israel are appalling and absolutely unacceptable. They fly in the face of the strong bipartisan vote that this body recently took to provide support for our vital ally, Israel, as it seeks to make sure that Hamas can never do again what it did on October 7.

The President’s actions, moreover, threaten to prolong the conflict that currently exists and are a threat to the long-term peace and stability of the region.

I am glad that we now have legislation before us that will rebuke the President and will ensure that the security assistance that this House has already approved finds its way to our ally, Israel.

I also speak in support of H.J. Res. 1213, which denounces calls to defund the police that have been so damaging to public safety and to law enforcement across this country.

In my own State of California, we have a number of jurisdictions, like in San Francisco, the East Bay, and Los Angeles, that did defund police and were then forced to restore that funding and to backtrack.

The reality is this is just one of a number of policies that have caused crime in California and many other places in this country to spiral out of control and have made the job of our law enforcement officers more and more difficult, to the point at which many departments are having a very difficult time with recruitment and retention and making sure they are fully

staffed and have the personnel that they need to keep their communities safe.

Policies like defunding the police, policies that have removed the consequences for criminal activity, policies by district attorneys who refuse to enforce the law, and sanctuary policies where individuals who are here illegally and commit serious crimes cannot be turned over to the immigration authorities are destructive policies that have manifested a disrespect toward our men and women in law enforcement who put their lives on the line every single day to keep our communities safe.

Madam Speaker, I urge strong bipartisan support for this resolution denouncing calls to defund the police, and I hope that we can swing the pendulum further in the direction of the support that our law enforcement deserves so that we don't continue to face these problems with recruitment and retention and so that we can keep our communities safe.

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

Madam Speaker, I am not familiar with the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), but let me say to the gentleman that, rather than just denounce the slogan of defunding the police, maybe the gentleman should go to the Republican Study Committee and tell them to not defund the police because, again, if one goes to the Republican Study Group document, page 148, it is clear that the Republicans want to defund the COPS program.

Please, enough with the rhetoric. If my colleagues are serious about supporting the police, then don't cut the COPS program, period. How hard is this?

I remind the gentleman that the hometown of the former Republican Speaker of this House, before the Republicans threw him out, Kevin McCarthy, which is Bakersfield, California, has a higher crime rate than San Francisco. I don't even know where my friends are coming from.

I have to say that I have never heard anybody denounce their home State as much as I have heard the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY) denounce New York. I think New York is a great State. It is not as good as Massachusetts, but I think it is a great State.

I get it. The gentleman just explained it all to me. If it is a Democratic-controlled area, all the crime is blamed on the Democrat. If it is a Republican-controlled area, then the majority finds the nearest Democrat, and Republicans blame it on the Democrat. That is their rationale.

I mean, come on. This place has to get more serious in terms of supporting initiatives to actually not only support law enforcement but protect our communities instead of one sound bite after another that does absolutely nothing and the blame game that we hear constantly.

Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues this week claim to want to focus on public safety but have chosen to put misguided measures and misleading bills on the floor. Here is their chance to actually do something of substance that will make police officers safer, make our streets safer, and make our children safer.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 715, a bipartisan bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

There were over 42,000 firearm deaths last year, with the annual total of mass shootings increasing from 414 in 2019 to over 650 in 2023. Eighty-six percent of homicides in this country involve a firearm, and of the States that saw their gun homicide rate decrease between 2022 and 2023, States with the strongest gun laws decreased their homicides by a rate nearly triple their lax gun law counterparts.

This is common sense. It is not a partisan issue. In fact, H.R. 715, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act, was introduced—hold on to your seats here—by a Republican.

I know that, like me, many of my colleagues have children and all of them have elementary schools and middle schools in their districts. I know Members see the toll this is taking on our Nation's children, our most vulnerable. Nearly 60 percent of teachers are worried about a shooting happening in their school, and one in four had a gun-related lockdown during the last school year. According to the Pew Research Center, one in five parents was extremely concerned about their child getting shot, and Republican leadership wants to do nothing.

This is barbaric. It is past time, Madam Speaker, and we are ready to work in a bipartisan way to end the epidemic of gun violence in this country.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. IVEY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I must say that Police Week, when I was a prosecutor at the Federal level and at the State level, was something I looked forward to. I worked closely with police officers, local, State, and Federal. They worked together as brothers and sisters in coordination and cooperation with prosecutors. In many instances, they had task forces where the Federal and local worked together, knowing that that was the way that made them most effective.

It was deeply disappointing to see the bills that came through this week that are supposed to be honoring police officers for Police Week. Some of these came through the Judiciary Committee beforehand, which I sit on, and so I raised objections at the time with respect to this legislation, which was ignored.

It is with a heavy heart, frankly, that I rise today because, as one of the Republican speakers a few minutes ago noted, I think 370 police officers have been shot. It is clear that one of the greatest dangers police officers face on the street is from guns.

□ 1300

The irony is that the legislation that the Republicans have proposed do nothing about guns. In fact, they don't even mention them in most cases, which is really shocking.

Now, my colleague from Massachusetts just mentioned a few minutes ago the Bipartisan Background Checks Act, H.R. 715, and he noted that the sponsor of that is a Republican, but he is the only Republican to join this bill. The other 207 cosponsors are all Democrats, and I think that speaks volumes about where the Republicans are these days on this kind of issue.

H.R. 2870, the Raise the Age Act, which is aimed at bolstering public safety by raising the age for individuals to buy assault weapons from 18 to 21, is commonsense legislation. It is already 21 for handguns. Why wouldn't we do it for assault weapons? We don't have one Republican cosponsor for that legislation.

Another example is H.R. 4992, that goes to ghost guns. The issue about ghost guns is that they are totally untraceable firearms, so they have become the weapon of choice for criminals across the country, blue States, red States, Democratic and Republican jurisdictions alike. There are zero Republican cosponsors for that legislation.

It is with great disappointment that we come here today and speak about Police Week, and we ought to be doing things to protect police officers from dangers on the street, but absolutely nothing that is in the legislative package that is being proposed would do that.

One last point before I yield back. With respect to the defund language, none of that is pending legislation with respect to police in the Congress right now. The only defund language that I have seen right now is defund ATF and FBI.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. Madam Speaker, those are sponsored by Republicans. The defund ATF bill is one sentence long. When I raised the question with the gentleman who proposed it in the committee, I said: How in the world is that supposed

to work? How would you defund the entire ATF knowing that we have got gun cases pending there now?

I have the same question about the FBI. International prosecutions, cartels, and the like, you would just shut them down like that? That is what those bills would do. Talk about being irresponsible. That is what that proposal is right now. Let's get serious.

We are facing major challenges. By the way, crime is going down in cities across the country. You mentioned the 2019 statistics. You stay with 2019 because violent crime has been going down in jurisdictions, including the District of Columbia this year, as well.

Let's get serious. Let's focus on doing things that really help protect police officers and make the most out of Police Week.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle are making some wild claims that somehow crime has gone down. It is like President Biden taking a bow for gas prices going from five bucks a gallon to four bucks a gallon when they were far less than that just before he was sworn in.

My colleague's claims rest on cherry-picked data that does not present a full picture of the crime problem in our major cities, so let's revisit some of the facts.

Violent crime has skyrocketed with year over year increases in violent crime in the millions. Carjackings have spiked by as much as 93 percent in many major cities and 18 percent more homicides were committed in 2023 than in 2019.

It is no coincidence that many of these major cities that have been the epicenter of the wave in violent crime also happen to be run by Democratic politicians with leftwing DAs that have made it their mission not to prosecute perpetrators but to put dangerous criminals back on the streets and to facilitate a revolving door criminal justice system.

My colleagues need only to venture beyond Capitol Hill to see what these policies have done to our Nation's Capital. To recap here, according to the Metro Police Department's own data, crime in D.C. increased 30 percent in 2023 compared to the previous year.

In 2023 alone, homicides increased 29 percent compared to 2022. In fact, since 2012, the rate of homicides in D.C. has doubled. Violent crime has increased 37 percent and robberies increased 65 percent from 2022 to 2023. Motor vehicle thefts increased 107 percent between 2022 and 2023.

This surge of criminal activity is a direct result of the D.C. Council's soft-on-crime sentencing policy and refusal to back up its law enforcement officers with real support, resulting in resignations of police officers. We have heard it directly in the Oversight Committee from the union officials.

Madam Speaker, despite my colleague's refusal to wake up to the reality, the fact remains that we are at this point today with crime soaring in

many of our major cities and Americans are feeling less safe because of the disastrous policies the Democratic leaders, at the behest of the radical left that governs their party have imposed on residents of our communities.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the gentleman keeps on talking about crime in D.C., crime in D.C., crime on the rise. I can tell you one thing; the crime is definitely down in the White House right now and I can understand why the gentleman is confused.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post, entitled: "Crime is down, though FOX News viewers might not be aware."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 2023]

CRIME IS DOWN, THOUGH FOX NEWS VIEWERS MIGHT NOT BE AWARE

(By Phillip Bump)

Crime declined in the third quarter of 2023 relative to the same period in 2022, according to data released by the FBI last week. Violent crime was down 8 percent in jurisdictions that reported data—law enforcement agencies covering three-quarters of U.S. residents. Property crime was down 6 percent. Murder was down more than 15 percent.

What's particularly useful about the new FBI data is that the shifts are presented by the population each responding agency serves. So we can see that the drop isn't a function just of a shift in smaller cities but, instead, occurred across the board. Property crime was up slightly—0.1 percent—in the most populous cities. But violent crime was down in those places, as it was everywhere else. In fact, the biggest cities saw the biggest drops in murder.

It's important to recognize the limits on this data. For one thing, data on crime is notoriously slow. The FBI didn't release summary data on 2022 until October. This quarter-to-quarter comparison, by contrast, is relatively expedient—but it is still only a look at one quarter of the year. It is also still several months old and limited to jurisdictions that returned information. If we look at the 10 largest cities, for example, we see that Los Angeles and Chicago are missing. In five of the eight that returned data, property crime was up. Only in Dallas, though, had murder climbed relative to the third quarter of 2022.

This is not the narrative that has dominated on the right, particularly on Fox News. Since crime began to surge during the pandemic, cable-news coverage of crime increased. But on Fox News in particular, coverage was consistently higher during the Biden administration relative to the first three years of Donald Trump's presidency. The peak came in October 2022—as the channel tried, successfully, to ensure that the rise in crime that had already begun to wane was a central discussion point for the midterm elections. That month, Fox News was three times as likely to mention crime in any 15-second block of airtime as was CNN.

Fox News coverage has consistently focused on crime in urban areas. There are a few obvious reasons, including that the Fox News audience (understandably) associates cities with Democratic leadership, because cities are more heavily non-White and that urban density increases the likelihood that

someone will capture an act of violence or vandalism on video that can run over and over and over again.

Even with crime dropping, Fox is still talking about crime as though it's on the rise. This is often done by cherry-picking, finding a city or a statistic where crime has gone up and then focusing on it. Often, though, it's simply presented as a given, which its audience—given what it sees on the news—will assume to be the case.

In response to the FBI report, Fox News offered a very useful distillation of how it makes lemonade out of the peck of lemons that is "crime isn't actually rising." On Saturday, NBC News's Ken Dilanian published a look at the FBI's data which noted polling showing that Americans think crime is rising. (This is almost always the case.) Fox News's response? To present Dilanian's report to its online readers as though the NBC presentation of facts was, instead, an indicator of media bias.

"NBC News story tells Americans they're 'wrong' to think crime is rising," the Fox News headline reads, "blames 'conditioning' of press." The piece is littered with similar scare quotes, with the apparent intent of reinforcing the belief that crime is rising solely by pointing out that the hated mainstream media says it isn't.

"Dilanian's report caps off another year in which ordinary Americans have expressed growing alarm about crime in big cities," the Fox News report notes—by itself a revealing admission. Whether there is "growing alarm" is taken for granted; that any such alarm would not be warranted isn't mentioned.

The reality is that crime surged in 2020—when Trump was president. That surge continued into the Biden administration but has since waned.

Given that Fox News invested so much effort in promoting crime as surging before the midterms despite lacking any evidence that it was (since it wasn't), we should not be surprised that its response to crime falling further is to melodramatically roll their eyes, point to mainstream reporting, and say the equivalent of, "get a load of these guys."

The reality is inconvenient for what it's spent the past three years telling its viewers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The article notes: "The reality is that crime surged in 2020—when Trump was President. That surge continued into the Biden administration but has since waned."

Madam Speaker, in the lead up to the 2022 midterms, FOX News invested immense resources in promoting stories about surging crime, despite lacking evidence. While crime is down, it appears the conservative ecosystem is trying to fearmonger the issue of crime, once again, because, you know, that is all they have.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from The Guardian, entitled: "Crime coverage on FOX News halved once U.S. midterms were over."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Guardian, Nov. 25, 2022]

CRIME COVERAGE ON FOX NEWS HALVED ONCE US MIDTERMS WERE OVER

(By Adam Gabbatt)

JUST A WEEK AFTER ELECTIONS, NUMBER OF WEEKLY SEGMENTS FOCUSED ON CRIME SLASHED IN HALF ON RUPERT MURDOCH'S FLAGSHIP NETWORK

In the weeks leading up to the US midterm elections, the message from Fox News was

clear: violent crime is surging, cities are dangerous hellscape and Democrats are responsible.

With the vote over, however, the rightwing news channel appeared to decide things weren't that bad after all, and decreased its coverage of violent crime by 50% compared with the pre-election average.

Media Matters for America, a media watchdog, found that each week from Labor Day until the Friday before the Tuesday 8 November vote, the network averaged 141 segments on crime across weekdays. The blanket crime coverage matched the Republican party's efforts to depict violent crime as out of control, and portray Democrats as responsible.

In the week of the midterms, however, once voting was over, Fox News aired just 71 segments on violent crime, Media Matters reported.

"I think this shows pretty clearly that the amount of Fox coverage of violent crime doesn't really have anything to do with the level of violent crime in America—it has to do with the political benefits," said Matt Gertz, a senior fellow at Media Matters.

"It crescendoed right before election day, and then once the election was over, so was America's crime crisis no longer the subject of maximum concern that it had been in the previous weeks."

Media Matters noted that Fox News crime coverage had increased somewhat in recent days after the shooting at the University of Virginia and the student killings in Idaho, but said "the coverage was notably less focused on painting Democratic cities as crime-infested".

Fox News declined to comment.

Gertz said Tucker Carlson, Fox News' most-watched host, had a big part to play in the coverage—and in how Republicans across the country used crime as an issue. In a monologue in August, Carlson advised Republican politicians to focus their campaigns on "law and order", which he said would result in a "red wave" in the midterms.

Republicans did just that, spending millions on ads which highlighted instances of violent crime and portrayed Democrats, like John Fetterman, running for US Senate in Pennsylvania, as responsible. The Washington Post reported that Republicans spent nearly \$50m on ads focused on crime between 5 September and 25 October, far outspending Democrats on the issue.

The network's focus on a singular issue in the lead-up to an election is nothing new, Gertz said. He said ahead of the 2014 midterm elections the Ebola outbreak became a repeated issue on Fox News, with the network blaming Barack Obama for the spread of the virus.

In 2016 Hillary Clinton's emails became the hot topic, while in 2018 Fox News picked up on a so-called "migrant caravan", using it to bolster Donald Trump's midterm election sell that the country needed to elect more Republicans to enact tougher immigration laws.

"It's a play that they've run over and over again in elections over the past decade," Gertz said.

"Fox does this every time they come up with some sort of message that they want to push, and they try to get Republicans to adopt it, and they try to get the mainstream press to adopt it as well," he added.

"And so the question becomes: to what extent is the mainstream press going to take the bait and turn it into a multiplier effect—where they are repeating Fox's message and the debate in the final days of the elections is turning on whatever Fox wanted to talk about?"

It seems this time neither the mainstream media nor voters took the bait.

Carlson's "red wave" failed to materialize in the midterm vote, as Republican candidates largely underperformed expectations.

Fetterman, the target of repeated attacks by Fox News and numerous crime ads from his opponent, Mehmet Oz, won his race by almost 5%, and while having been predicted to make significant gains in Congress, Republicans only narrowly took control of the House, and Democrats retained the Senate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, so after a frenzy of coverage about violent crime in September and October 2022, the conservative media giant FOX News actually decreased coverage of violent crime stories by 50 percent in the weeks following the 2022 elections.

Crime stories have long been used by Republicans to fearmonger for cheap, electoral victories, and it seems like this old tactic is being utilized, once again, in 2024, all while 80 percent of Republicans support cutting the COPS grant program.

Madam Speaker, I urge my friends who don't believe me to go to the Republican Study Committee FY 2025 Budget proposal—this is the most recent one—and go to page 148. You will see under the heading, Reduce Funding for Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), it is my Republican friends—for all the talk about defunding the police—that are leading the way because there in their Republican Study Committee, which is the largest caucus in the Republican Conference, they have put out a report highlighting their budget priorities, which talks about eliminating the COPS program. You can't make this stuff up.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think it is important that we don't forget all the other legislation in this bill, as we have had a spirited debate today about law enforcement.

It is really important to remind my colleagues today about the situation in Israel and the Israel legislation that is being considered this week. We need to talk about how this conflict began. On October 7, it was Hamas and not Israel that launched a horrifying terror attack that took thousands of lives and innocent people hostage.

It was Hamas terrorists who murdered approximately 1,200 people, including Holocaust survivors, the elderly, babies, and beautiful young people attending a music festival. It is Hamas who, to this day, has over 100 innocent people held hostage, including American citizens who we cannot forget are being held hostage. Americans are currently being held hostage in Gaza.

Hamas is responsible for this war. Hamas, a terrorist organization, has for decades now used civilian structures and innocent people to shield their terrorist operations. However, Madam Speaker, none of that stopped anti-Israel protesters from taking to the streets just a day after the horrific attacks and the butchery of Israeli ci-

vilians to chant "from the river to the sea."

There are some people that serve in this building that take their time and like to chant "from the river to the sea," and they need to be held accountable for that, which we know is synonymous language for the extermination of the Jewish people in Israel.

Madam Speaker, by holding these arms shipments, President Biden is just not flouting the will of Congress and the American people, but he is also kowtowing to the radical left that, frankly, has embraced the anti-Israel movement wholeheartedly. It has become practically a platform plank over there.

We are learning more and more about the leftwing groups and donors that are bankrolling the anti-Israel/anti-Semitic protests that have erupted across the country. We noted that it is the far left, including Members of the House, that have fully endorsed this message to turn against our ally Israel in their hour of need and to isolate them and to ultimately support their destruction.

Madam Speaker, I am done hearing the false equivalencies of a morally bankrupt movement. Anyone who remembers the true reason why Israel is defending itself today should support the legislation under this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I am unable to rebut all the nonsense I just heard, and I am exhausted by this debate. Let me touch on two things. First, we haven't heard a single word from our colleagues across the aisle acknowledging the very real challenges civilians in Gaza are experiencing every day under this war. We have not heard a single word.

If we send massive 2,000-pound bombs to Netanyahu without any assurances on how they will be used, it could mean unprecedented, catastrophic civilian casualties. I mean, these are people that we are talking about, innocent people—boys and girls, brothers and sisters, moms and dads, grandparents, babies.

Where is our humanity? Where is our humanity? These are people who are already struggling with shortages of food, water, shelter, medical supplies, the basic things that humans need to survive. They fled to Rafah because that is where Netanyahu told them to go to escape the bombing of Hamas. Now, Netanyahu is saying he is going to bomb them anyway, and there is no plan to safely evacuate them to any other place.

I don't care whether there is another country that does it. Killing civilians is wrong. It is always wrong. You can be a friend of Israel, a strong ally of Israel, and also be a critic when it comes to the Netanyahu government.

You can be a strong friend of Israel and say that more massive civilian casualties will undercut Israel's security. This is not the way to go.

You can feel as I do that what happened on October 7, the horrific attack by Hamas on Israeli civilians. It was unconscionable. There aren't enough adjectives to describe how horrific that was.

The taking of hostages is a war crime. We want them released. You can feel that way, but also understand that we have an obligation to protect civilian lives in Gaza.

I am grateful to President Biden for taking the step that he did, and I wish he would do more, quite frankly. It is disappointing for me to see that so many of my friends across the aisle seem indifferent to it.

Madam Speaker, coming down here to get lectured about crime from the party whose leader is a criminal is really something else.

My friend from New York not once rebutted our contention that Republicans have advocated cutting the COPS grant because it is here in print. Anybody can see it.

For those who want to know why this program is good, it is because it provides money to help local law enforcement be able to hire and recruit police officers, especially in areas where budgets are tight.

It is a lifeline for so many communities, rural and urban, all throughout this country, and they are advocating eliminating it. Give me a break.

None of the measures the House of Representatives are putting forth this week do a single thing to protect Americans, secure our communities, or improve law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, the real shame here is that if Republicans were willing to set their partisanship aside and work across the aisle, maybe we could get something substantive done because the reality is that Democrats want to keep people safe, and we know how to do it.

□ 1315

We need to invest in programs that get at the root causes of crime, and we need to address gun violence in our schools and make sure police aren't put in situations that they aren't trained to handle. We know the key to improving safety in our neighborhoods is not to use our law enforcement officers like political pawns.

At the end of the day, the Republican commitment to chaos, extremism, and politicking over legislating is hurting our ability to improve people's lives. I have to be honest: I think it is going to backfire on them.

Even one of our Republican colleagues took to the floor and said as much last year: "Nothing but empty promises." He went to say: "We haven't done anything," meaning Republicans. "One thing. I want my Republican colleagues to give me one thing—one—that I can go campaign on and say we did—one—anybody sitting in the complex, if you want to come down to the floor and come explain to me one material, meaningful, signifi-

cant thing the Republican majority has done."

That is a Republican saying that. They know they are getting nowhere in this Congress.

All I can say, Madam Speaker, is the American people deserve better, and they certainly deserve better than the Speaker of the House spending his time trying to influence our justice system at a courthouse in New York City. How pathetic. When we have real problems that we need to deal with here in this country, he is in New York trying to explain away, like a staffer, all of Donald Trump's problems, quite frankly.

I am trying to think of a way to stay within order here with the new rules. It is pathetic. It is pathetic. That is where the Speaker of the House is spending his time, trying to rationalize all of the former President's crimes. Give me a break.

Madam Speaker, the American people, as I said, deserve better. I urge a strong "no" vote on this rule. This is just a waste of time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I wish my colleague from Massachusetts well with his Trump derangement syndrome.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today is about standing up for the safety and well-being of our neighborhoods, our families, and our way of life. It is about standing up for what is right and defending those who risk their lives every single day to keep our communities safe.

In my own district in the southern tier of New York, a Chemung County Sheriff's investigator, Michael Theetge, was critically injured when he was hit by a shoplifter's getaway car and has since been fighting to recover. Our prayers and wishes for a speedy recovery are with him and our whole community.

Sadly, Investigator Theetge's case is not an isolated incident. It is emblematic of the dangers to law enforcement officers and what they face every time they put on their uniforms.

In my own State of New York, we have lost some of our very finest recently. We have recently laid to rest Lieutenant Michael Hoosock of the Onondaga County Sheriff's Department, Syracuse Police Officer Michael Jensen, and NYPD Officer Jonathan Diller.

We don't want other families to have to go through what their families are facing right now and to be able to expect that their loved ones will come home at the end of their shifts safe and sound.

What is happening in America's major cities in too many States and right here in our Nation's Capital is simply unacceptable, and it needs to be addressed now and is with this legislation before us.

This rule, Madam Speaker, is also about standing up for our closest friends and allies. Since October 7, Israel has been in a struggle for self-de-

fense against a terrorist organization that seeks nothing but violence, destruction, and extermination of the Jewish people.

Israel needs the tools to defend itself and defeat Hamas. We need to send a message to the world that America will not falter in our commitment to our allies. We need to send these munitions to Israel now. Our future and their future depend on it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1227 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 715) to require a background check for every firearm sale. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 715.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1227;

Adoption of House Resolution 1227, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3935.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8369, ISRAEL SECURITY ASSISTANCE SUPPORT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7530, D.C. CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT OF 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7343, DETAIN AND DEPORT ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO ASSAULT COPS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8146, POLICE OUR BORDER ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7581, IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT OF 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 354, LEOSA REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1213, RESOLUTION REGARDING VIOLENCE AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1210, CONDEMNING THE BIDEN BORDER CRISIS AND THE TREMENDOUS BURDENS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FACE AS A RESULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1227) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8369) to provide for the expeditious delivery of defense articles and defense services for Israel and other matters; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7530) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8146) to require a report by the Attorney General on the impact the border crisis is having on law enforcement at the Federal, State, local, and Tribal level; providing for consider-

ation of the bill (H.R. 7581) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 354) to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1213) a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1210) condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 201, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—212

Aderholt	Finstad	Lee (FL)
Alford	Fischbach	Lesko
Allen	Fitzgerald	Letlow
Armodei	Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk
Armstrong	Fleischmann	Lucas
Arrington	Flood	Luetkemeyer
Babin	Foxx	Luna
Bacon	Franklin, Scott	Luttrell
Baird	Fry	Mace
Balderson	Fulcher	Malliotakis
Banks	Gaetz	Maloy
Bean (FL)	Garbarino	Mann
Bentz	Garcia, Mike	Massie
Bergman	Gimenez	Mast
Bice	Gonzales, Tony	McCauley
Biggs	Good (VA)	McClintock
Bilirakis	Gooden (TX)	McCormick
Bishop (NC)	Gosar	McHenry
Boebert	Graves (LA)	Meuser
Bost	Graves (MO)	Miller (IL)
Brecheen	Green (TN)	Miller (OH)
Buchanan	Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)
Bucshon	Griffith	Miller-Meeks
Burchett	Grothman	Mills
Burgess	Guest	Molinaro
Burlison	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Calvert	Hageman	Moore (AL)
Cammack	Harris	Moore (UT)
Carey	Harshbarger	Moran
Carl	Hern	Murphy
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Nehls
Carter (TX)	Hill	Newhouse
Chavez-DeRemer	Hinson	Norman
Ciscomani	Houchin	Nunn (IA)
Cline	Hudson	Obernolte
Cloud	Huizenga	Ogles
Clyde	Hunt	Owens
Cole	Issa	Palmer
Collins	Jackson (TX)	Pence
Comer	James	Perry
Crane	Johnson (LA)	Pfleger
Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Posey
Crenshaw	Jordan	Reschenthaler
Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
D'Esposito	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Davidson	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (KY)
De La Cruz	Kelly (MS)	Rose
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Rosendale
Donalds	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Duarte	Kiley	Roy
Duncan	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Dunn (FL)	Kustoff	Salazar
Edwards	LaHood	Scalise
Ellzey	LaLota	Schweikert
Emmer	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Estes	Lamborn	Self
Ezell	Langworthy	Sessions
Fallon	Latta	Simpson
Feenstra	LaTurner	Smith (MO)
Ferguson	Lawler	Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tennet
Thompson (PA)

Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—201

Adams	Golden (ME)	Pallone
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Allred	Gomez	Pappas
Amo	Gonzalez,	Pascarell
Auchincloss	Vicente	Pelosi
Balint	Gottheimer	Peltola
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Peters
Bera	Hayes	Pettersen
Beyer	Himes	Phillips
Bishop (GA)	Horsford	Pingree
Blumenauer	Houlahan	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer	Porter
Bonamici	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Bowman	Huffman	Quigley
Brown	Ivey	Ramirez
Brownley	Jackson (IL)	Raskin
Budzinski	Jackson (NC)	Ross
Bush	Jacobs	Ruiz
Caraveo	Jayapal	Ryan
Carbajal	Jeffries	Salinas
Cardenas	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez
Carson	Kamlager-Dove	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Kaptur	Scanlon
Cartwright	Keating	Schakowsky
Caspar	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Case	Kennedy	Schneider
Casten	Khanna	Scholten
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Cherfilus-	Lucas	Scott, David
McCormick	Kuster	Sewell
Chu	Landsman	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lee (NV)	Sorensen
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Soto
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Costa	Levin	Stansbury
Courtney	Lieu	Stanton
Craig	Loifgren	Stevens
Crockett	Lynch	Strickland
Crow	Manning	Suozi
Cuellar	Matsui	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	McBath	Sykes
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Takano
Davis (NC)	McCollum	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	McGarvey	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Meeks	Titus
DelBene	Menendez	Tlaib
Deluzio	Meng	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	Mfume	Tonko
Dingell	Moore (WI)	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Morelle	Torres (NY)
Escobar	Moskowitz	Trahan
Eshoo	Moulton	Underwood
Espallat	Mrvan	Vargas
Fletcher	Mullin	Vasquez
Foster	Nadler	Veasey
Foushee	Napolitano	Velazquez
Frankel, Lois	Neal	Wasserman
Frost	Neguse	Schultz
Gallego	Nickel	Waters
Garamendi	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Omar	Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—17

Barr	Granger	Mooney
Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Wexton
Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)
Garcia, Robert	McClain	

□ 1403

Ms. ADAMS and Mr. MORELLE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 200, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Garbarino	Miller (WV)
Alford	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Gimenez	Mills
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Molinaro
Armstrong	Gonzalez,	Moolenaar
Arrington	Vicente	Moore (AL)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Moran
Baird	Gosar	Murphy
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Banks	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Bean (FL)	Green (TN)	Norman
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Griffith	Obernolte
Bice	Grothman	Ogles
Biggs	Guest	Owens
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Pence
Boebert	Harris	Perry
Bost	Harshbarger	Pfluger
Brecheen	Hern	Posey
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Bucshon	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Burchett	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burlison	Hudson	Rose
Calvert	Huizenga	Rosendale
Cammack	Hunt	Rouzer
Carey	Issa	Roy
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	James	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kiley	Smucker
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Staubert
Curtis	LaHood	Steel
D'Esposito	LaLota	Stefanik
Davidson	Lamborn	Steil
De La Cruz	Langworthy	Steube
DesJarlais	Latta	Strong
Donalds	LaTurner	Tenney
Duarte	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Timmons
Edwards	Letlow	Turner
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Valadao
Emmer	Lucas	Van Drew
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Van Duyne
Ezell	Luna	Van Orden
Fallon	Luttrell	Wagner
Feenstra	Mace	Walberg
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Waltz
Finstad	Maloy	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	Mann	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	Massie	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Westerman
Fleischmann	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Flood	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Fox	McCormick	Wilson (SC)
Franklin, Scott	McHenry	Wittman
Fry	Meuser	Womack
Fulcher	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Gaetz	Miller (OH)	Zinke

NOES—200

Adams	Garcia, Robert	Panetta
Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Pappas
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Pascarell
Amo	Gomez	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Peltola
Balint	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Barragán	Harder (CA)	Peters
Beatty	Hayes	Petterson
Bera	Himes	Phillips
Beyer	Horsford	Pingree
Bishop (GA)	Houlahan	Pocan
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Bonamici	Huffman	Quigley
Bowman	Ivey	Ramirez
Brown	Jackson (IL)	Raskin
Brownley	Jackson (NC)	Ross
Budzinski	Jacobs	Ruiz
Bush	Jayapal	Ryan
Caraveo	Jeffries	Salinas
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
Cárdenas	Kamlager-Dove	Sarbanes
Carson	Kaptur	Scanlon
Carter (LA)	Keating	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Casar	Kennedy	Schneider
Case	Khanna	Scholten
Casten	Kildee	Schrier
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Cherfilus-	Kuster	Sewell
McCormick	Landsman	Sherman
Chu	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clark (MA)	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Lee (NV)	Sorensen
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Soto
Connolly	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Correa	Levin	Stansbury
Costa	Lieu	Stanton
Courtney	Loftgren	Stevens
Craig	Lynch	Strickland
Crockett	Manning	Swalwell
Crow	Matsui	Sykes
Cuellar	McBath	Takano
Davids (KS)	McClellan	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Davis (NC)	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)
Dean (PA)	McGovern	Titus
DeGette	Meeks	Tlaib
DeLauro	Menendez	Tokuda
DeBene	Meng	Tonko
Deluzio	Mfume	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Morelle	Trahan
Doggett	Moskowitz	Underwood
Escobar	Moulton	Vargas
Eshoo	Mrvan	Vasquez
Españillat	Mullin	Veasey
Fletcher	Nadler	Velázquez
Foster	Napolitano	Wasserman
Foushee	Neal	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Waters
Frost	Nickel	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Norcross	Wild
Garamendi	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Omar	
Garcia (TX)	Pallone	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Ruppersberger

NOT VOTING—17

Barr	Grijalva	Mooney
Boyle (PA)	Jackson Lee	Suozi
Cleaver	Kim (NJ)	Trone
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Wexton
Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)
Granger	McClain	

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECURING GROWTH AND ROBUST LEADERSHIP IN AMERICAN AVIATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in

the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes, 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 gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 26, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—387

Adams	Correa	Green (TN)
Aderholt	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Aguilar	Courtney	Griffith
Alford	Craig	Guest
Allen	Crawford	Guthrie
Allred	Crenshaw	Hageman
Amo	Crockett	Harder (CA)
Amodei	Crow	Harris
Armstrong	Cuellar	Harshbarger
Arrington	Curtis	Hayes
Auchincloss	D'Esposito	Hern
Babin	Davids (KS)	Hill
Bacon	Davis (IL)	Himes
Baird	Davis (NC)	Hinson
Balderson	De La Cruz	Horsford
Balint	Dean (PA)	Houchin
Banks	DeGette	Houlahan
Barragán	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bean (FL)	DeBene	Hoyle (OR)
Beatty	Deluzio	Hudson
Bentz	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Bera	DesJarlais	Huizenga
Bergman	Dingell	Hunt
Bice	Doggett	Issa
Bilirakis	Donalds	Ivey
Bishop (GA)	Duarte	Jackson (NC)
Bishop (NC)	Duncan	Jackson (TX)
Blumenauer	Dunn (FL)	Jacobs
Blunt Rochester	Edwards	James
Boebert	Ellzey	Jayapal
Bonamici	Emmer	Jeffries
Bost	Escobar	Johnson (GA)
Bowman	Eshoo	Johnson (LA)
Brown	Españillat	Jordan
Brownley	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Buchanan	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Bucshon	Fallon	Kamlager-Dove
Budzinski	Feenstra	Kaptur
Burgess	Ferguson	Kean (NJ)
Burlison	Finstad	Keating
Bush	Fischbach	Kelly (IL)
Calvert	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Cammack	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Caraveo	Fleischmann	Kennedy
Carbajal	Fletcher	Khanna
Cárdenas	Flood	Kiggans (VA)
Carey	Foster	Kildee
Carl	Foushee	Kiley
Carson	Fox	Kilmer
Carter (GA)	Frankel, Lois	Kim (CA)
Carter (LA)	Franklin, Scott	Krishnamoorthi
Carter (TX)	Frost	Kuster
Cartwright	Fry	Kustoff
Casar	Fulcher	LaHood
Case	Gallego	LaLota
Casten	Garamendi	LaMalfa
Castor (FL)	Garbarino	Lamborn
Castro (TX)	Garcia (IL)	Landsman
Chavez-DeRemer	Garcia (TX)	Langworthy
Cherfilus-	Garcia, Mike	Larsen (WA)
McCormick	Garcia, Robert	Larson (CT)
Chu	Gimenez	Latta
Ciscomani	Golden (ME)	LaTurner
Clark (MA)	Goldman (NY)	Lawler
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Lee (CA)
Cline	Gonzales, Tony	Lee (FL)
Cloud	Gonzalez,	Lee (NV)
Clyburn	Vicente	Lee (PA)
Clyde	Gooden (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Cohen	Gosar	Lesko
Cole	Gottheimer	Letlow
Collins	Graves (LA)	Levin
Comer	Graves (MO)	Lieu

Lofgren	Pascarell	Stansbury
Loudermilk	Pelosi	Stanton
Lucas	Peltola	Staubert
Luetkemeyer	Pence	Steel
Luttrell	Perez	Stefanik
Lynch	Peters	Steil
Mace	Pettersen	Stevens
Malliotakis	Pfluger	Strickland
Maloy	Phillips	Strong
Mann	Pingree	Suozzi
Manning	Pocan	Swalwell
Mast	Porter	Sykes
Matsui	Posey	Takano
McBath	Pressley	Tenney
McCauley	Quigley	Thanedar
McCollum	Ramirez	Thompson (CA)
McCormick	Raskin	Thompson (MS)
McGarvey	Reschenthaler	Thompson (PA)
McGovern	Rodgers (WA)	Tiffany
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Timmons
Menendez	Rogers (KY)	Titus
Meng	Rose	Tlaib
Meuser	Ross	Tokuda
Mfume	Rouzer	Tonko
Miller (IL)	Roy	Torres (CA)
Miller (OH)	Ruiz	Torres (NY)
Miller (WV)	Ruppersberger	Trahan
Miller-Meeks	Rutherford	Turner
Mills	Ryan	Underwood
Molinaro	Salazar	Valadao
Moolenaar	Salinas	Van Drew
Moore (AL)	Sánchez	Van Dуйne
Moore (UT)	Sarbanes	Van Orden
Moore (WI)	Scalise	Vargas
Moran	Scanlon	Vasquez
Morelle	Schakowsky	Veasey
Moskowitz	Schiff	Velázquez
Moulton	Schneider	Wagner
Mrvan	Scholten	Walberg
Mullin	Schrier	Waltz
Murphy	Schweikert	Wasserman
Nadler	Scott, Austin	Schultz
Napolitano	Scott, David	Waters
Neal	Self	Watson Coleman
Neguse	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Nehls	Sewell	Webster (FL)
Newhouse	Sherman	Wenstrup
Nickel	Sherrill	Westerman
Norcross	Simpson	Wild
Nunn (IA)	Slotkin	Williams (GA)
Obermoite	Smith (MO)	Williams (NY)
Ocasio-Cortez	Smith (NE)	Williams (TX)
Omar	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Owens	Smith (WA)	Wittman
Pallone	Smucker	Womack
Palmer	Sorensen	Yakym
Pappas	Soto	Zinke

NAYS—26

Beyer	Greene (GA)	Ogles
Biggs	Grothman	Panetta
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Burchett	Jackson (IL)	Rosendale
Connolly	Luna	Scott (VA)
Crane	Massie	Spanberger
Davidson	McClellan	Spartz
Gaetz	McClintock	Steube
Good (VA)	Norman	

NOT VOTING—17

Barr	Grijalva	Meeks
Boyle (PA)	Jackson Lee	Mooney
Cleaver	Johnson (SD)	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Wexton
Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)
Granger	McClain	

□ 1416

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 200.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be present to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted NO on Roll Call No. 198, NO on Roll Call No. 199, and NO on Roll Call No. 200.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

DETAIN AND DEPORT ILLEGAL
ALIENS WHO ASSAULT COPS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 7343.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7343.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1421

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, with Mr. FULCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

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

Mr. Chair, my bill, the Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act, sends a simple but clear message: If an illegal alien assaults our law enforcement officers, they will be detained and they will be deported. This is because these actions must have consequences.

Now, that seems like a pretty commonsense life lesson that most of us have learned at a very early age, but it is a lesson, unfortunately, that President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas never have learned.

In less than 3½ years, President Biden has released nearly 4.9 million il-

legal aliens into the United States. That doesn't include the got-aways. That doesn't include a whole lot, and in most cases, we don't even know who these people are. We don't even know where they are going. We don't even know their intentions once they are here, Mr. Chair.

The Biden administration's policies are reckless, and these policies are dangerous. These policies have very real-life consequences, particularly for American law enforcement.

Here are just a couple of examples: In March 2023, an illegal alien violently assaulted a U.S. Border Patrol agent as the agent attempted to take the alien into custody, injuring the agent's face and his arms.

In November 2022, the FBI arrested two illegal aliens for pushing, dragging, and punching a U.S. Border Patrol agent.

Now, the chaos at the southwest border is spreading into communities, towns, and cities throughout the United States of America, and there is no end in sight.

Take this example just from this past January. It is just one example. According to the New York Post: As many as 14 migrants were believed to have been involved in a brutal beatdown of two NYPD officers in Times Square.

To make matters worse, because of New York's far-left, extreme soft-on-crime policies, many of the attackers were freed without bail. Everybody heard me right: Freed without bail. Moreover, they were given reduced sentences through very weak plea deals.

Some of the alleged attackers received a taxpayer-funded bus ride straight to California. Some of the attackers were arrested again while out on bail. The border crisis meets a sanctuary city and a sanctuary State. What a bad combination.

Are we surprised by the results of this completely broken system, Mr. Chair?

I don't think so. These are actions without consequences. This is Joe Biden's America. The longer Joe Biden and his administration go without taking action and holding these bad actors accountable, the longer our American citizens will suffer.

That is why I introduced this bill. That is why it is so important that we pass laws that rein in lawlessness in this country.

Actions must have consequences. This bill takes an important step in ensuring that we have zero tolerance for those in our country who break our laws and assault those who are sworn to protect and to serve our American communities.

This bill requires the DHS Secretary to issue a detainer for illegal aliens who are charged with, arrested for, convicted of, or have admitted to assaulting a law enforcement officer. It also requires DHS to quickly take custody of the alien if the alien isn't already detained.

By requiring mandatory detention for illegal aliens who assault cops, the bill not only prevents these dangerous criminals from being loose on American streets, but it also speeds up the process to remove them from the United States of America entirely.

The time for standing by and doing nothing must end.

We cannot stand by as the fabric of our American society devolves into violence and lawlessness. Americans are tired of it.

The bill isn't just a commonsense solution to removing illegal aliens from our streets and out of the country, it is a call for action and a demand for accountability to those who would break our laws, and it is a reminder that those who do will face real consequences.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this overly broad and unnecessary legislation. Supposedly, this bill would subject any undocumented immigrant to mandatory immigration detention if they commit an assault on a law enforcement officer.

To be clear, that is already current law.

However, this bill goes far beyond that. It would subject even those individuals with lawful status, like DACA and temporary protected status, to mandatory detention if they are merely arrested or charged with assault on a law enforcement officer.

There are no provisions to protect those who are mistakenly arrested and are released without charges. In addition, the definition of "assault" varies widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Nevertheless, this bill adopts the definition of "assault" used in the local jurisdiction to subject somebody to mandatory detention.

That means that conduct that people would not normally think of as an assault, like literally touching an officer, could result in an arrest and mandatory detention. Furthermore, people are mistakenly arrested for assault on a police officer far more often than we would like to admit.

When this bill was introduced, it was clearly in response to an incident earlier this year in which some recently arrived migrants allegedly assaulted a group of law enforcement officers in Times Square.

□ 1430

That incident sparked outrage across the country, but our Republican colleagues directed much of their ire at one particular individual who flipped off TV cameras as he left his arraignment. The image was plastered all over FOX News and was promoted by former President Trump as a symbol of everything that is wrong with the Biden administration's approach to immigration.

There was only one problem, Mr. Chairman. As it turned out, that specific individual, who everyone was so quick to demonize and attack, had the charges dropped against him. Despite being arrested and initially charged, he was not even present when this crime occurred.

We also see this in protests, where one person gets unruly and the police arrest everyone in the crowd.

Let's be clear: Violence is never the answer and should never be used in a political protest. It was wrong for people to assault the police right here in the United States Capitol on January 6, just as it is wrong for people to assault the police or anyone else during any protest, regardless of their politics.

That is why U.S. law already makes assault a crime. Admitting to or being convicted of a serious assault on a law enforcement officer already results in immigration consequences under current law, including mandatory detention and deportation.

This bill doesn't change that, doesn't make anybody safer, and doesn't fix any problems in the immigration system. Instead, this legislation deems everyone guilty until proven innocent.

It serves only to further the Republican agenda to fearmonger about immigrants and keep immigration in the news during an election year while, at the same time, bankrolling the private, for-profit prison companies.

This bill is going nowhere fast, just like the very similar bill that House Republicans passed last Police Week.

The American people aren't stupid. They see what House Republicans are doing. They want meaningful reforms to the system, and they know that bills like this would do absolutely nothing toward that end.

House Republicans refuse to negotiate on immigration, and the majority fails to do anything that would actually solve some of these problems we face, only to turn around and complain when those problems get worse.

This is political theater at its worst, and I urge all of my colleagues to join with me to oppose this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle on one thing: The American people are not stupid.

The American people know, see, hear, and feel what is going on around them. The American people know that their streets aren't as safe. The American people who live in certain cities know that their kids are being moved out of their schools so that we can house illegals. The American people know that they are paying lots of taxes, and they are paying taxes in so many ways—to pay for transportation, to pay for housing, to pay for legal care, to pay for bank cards, to pay for all kinds of services to illegals, including, in

some cases, education subsidies. The American people are not stupid, and they are tired of it.

Additionally, they are really tired of individuals who come from other countries illegally. Let me be clear because I never want this to be morphed into anything else. We love legal immigration in America. Some of our best citizens are legal immigrants. It is illegal immigration that creates this problem.

What we know is that there are illegals who break the law once when they come over. Then, they break the law again by committing an illegal act by assaulting someone—in some cases, a police officer.

We had cases here just recently. This was published on May 14: "Migrants charged in attack on NYPD cops in Times Square offered plea deals." They were offered a plea deal, but they can still stay in the country. They broke the law when they came here. Then, they came here and broke a law again by assaulting someone. Then, they were let out again, and they broke the law again.

This isn't for an election. This is to try to save our country and the American people. They are tired of it, and law enforcement is tired of it.

We ask law enforcement, these men and women, to protect this Nation, to protect our people, and then we don't back them up. It is wrong. It is un-American.

I want to address something else because we are the United States of America. On top of it all, this is probably the only country in the world where you can come here illegally because we have open borders. Other countries don't allow this. No country can prevail with it.

Currently, we allow it, unfortunately. They come here. We allow them here. They break the law here, and we still give them due process.

Yes, they should be detained. I will tell you something else. Do you know why they need to be detained? They need to be detained. I hope everybody sits down with the inspector general for Homeland Security, like I did, for 1½ hours. He would tell you they check the names, addresses, and locations where you are supposed to find those illegals when they are allowed in the country. They are vacant lots. They are vacant storefronts. They are nonexistent addresses. Once they are in, we can't find them anymore, and that is the truth. Additionally, they are breaking the law sometimes, and that is the truth.

When they are here and break the law, they have to be detained so we know where they are. Then, they will go through due process and will come before a judge. If a mistake has been made and something is wrong, it will be dealt with the way that it is dealt with always in the United States of America.

If they have broken the law once, twice, three times, four times, they should be detained, and then they -

should be deported. They don't belong in the United States of America.

That is not what immigration is about. Immigration is about coming here, loving this country, pledging to the flag, loving America.

If you asked in my world what it would be, if you break the law and come here illegally, you should be detained and sent back, period. You don't even have to assault anybody.

At a very minimum, for God's sake, let's get this done. Enough is enough.

The American people are smart, and the American people are tired. They are tired of it. They are tired of being unsafe and tired of it costing them so much money in tax dollars. They are tired of not being able to take care of their kids, not being able to pay their grocery bills, and worrying about their Social Security and Medicare because we are spending money on all of this other stuff. It is enough. They have had it. I have had it. I believe the majority of this Congress has had it.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, assaulting a law enforcement officer is a serious offense that deserves both criminal and immigration consequences. That is why serious assaults on law enforcement officers are already immigration violations that require detention and deportation.

The bill before us today would do absolutely nothing to change that. This legislation instead would dramatically expand the type of conduct that would subject somebody to mandatory detention, to include people who may not have even committed a crime at all.

That is not a good use of our limited law enforcement resources. Instead of wasting our time on these bills that do nothing to fix our immigration system and stand no chance of becoming law, we should be talking about how to create a workable immigration system that allows Americans to reunite with their families and allows American businesses and universities to attract the best and the brightest, essentially creating a workable process so that people wouldn't be forced to go to the border as the only way to come to the United States.

We should be talking about the fact that immigrants are good for the country and good for our economy. One in four American doctors were born abroad, and roughly 45 percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or the children of immigrants. Seventy percent of agricultural workers are immigrants.

Immigrants feed us, heal us, and help ensure that this country remains an economic powerhouse. We could be embracing the positive impacts of immigrants rather than demonizing them.

The Congressional Budget Office recently announced that new immigrants will add \$1 trillion in previously unexpected revenue to our country's GDP

between 2023 and 2024. Similarly, the Department of Health and Human Services found that, over a 15-year period, asylees and refugees contributed nearly \$124 billion more in revenue than they received in services from the government. Documented and undocumented immigrants paid tens of billions of dollars in taxes each year.

The majority insists on scapegoating and fearmongering immigrants. It is true that the immigration system has deep problems, but they cannot be solved through an enforcement-only approach. We have been trying that approach for 30 years, and it has failed.

The truth is that the immigration system is all connected. People are coming to the border because the legal immigration system has not been updated in over 30 years, and they cannot find any other pathway to come in.

The majority often talks about legal immigrants. Let me say that the wait time for some permanent residents to bring their families into this country is over a century-long—a century for legal permanent residents to bring their family members into the country.

Employers are begging us to modernize the employment-based immigration system because the limits on high-tech visas were set when floppy disks were the height of technology. These companies cannot hire the people who they need.

Additionally, the small number of immigration judges that we have are absolutely crushed under a massive backlog of asylum cases so extensive that it is now taking people over 8 years to even get a hearing.

Why doesn't the majority just help us put more money into immigration judges so we can resolve that backlog? Why not open legal pathways for people who are trying to come here legally?

I know this, Mr. Chairman, because I came here, and it took me 17 years to navigate the immigration system and become a U.S. citizen, but that was several decades ago. Now, you can't even get through the process.

I hope that one day we can get back to actually governing, to passing real bills that can make a difference in the lives of the American people. I fear, Mr. Chairman, that today is not that day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I said I agreed with the gentlewoman on one issue. I am going to agree with her on a second one, that immigration is a good thing, but let's not morph this. Let's be really clear. Legal immigration is good. Illegal immigration is not.

Let's talk about legal immigration for a minute. I always like to tell this story because it is a real story. It is a true story. I have a whole bunch of them.

I have, in my district, many legal immigrants who came here, who work hard, who are taking care of their families, who love the United States of America so much.

I had this friend of mine who bought a small store and gas station. He lived above it, did it beautifully, reconstructed the whole thing. His kids did well in school. His wife worked hard along his side, and we talked about the issues of the day. I would always stop by there. That is a true story.

One day, I went by, and he was there. By the way, he was somebody who believes in American values, and I guess that is the point I am going to make. I go by, and I am talking to him. He starts to tear up, for real. He is a big guy. He is a tough guy. He has gone through a lot in his life. I asked what was wrong.

He said: This was a big day for me yesterday.

I asked what happened. I thought maybe he lost a family member. I didn't know what happened to him.

He said: I became a United States citizen, an American citizen. I am so proud.

This is real.

He said: I am proud to defend this country. I would fight for this country. I love this country. I will stand up against any foe of this country. This is the greatest country ever on the face of the Earth.

That is a good thing.

Illegal aliens who come here and flip off the cameras when they are walking out of court because they have been released, illegal aliens who commit crime after crime and keep getting released because of prosecutors that are ultraleft, illegal aliens who get all kinds of benefits but don't want to work hard in America—and that is not all of them, but there are some—illegal aliens who don't even love the United States of America but come here because they want to reap financial benefits, that is not a good thing.

Don't let anyone ever say that because you oppose illegal aliens, you oppose immigration. That is not true.

□ 1445

It is a sad state of affairs that we are in that this bill is even needed, but given the abandoned southwest border and the violence of the Biden border crisis that it has unleashed on our communities and every community in this great country, the Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act is another necessary piece of legislation.

It is important. It means something. Actions do have consequences. Mr. Chair, what you do has consequences, what I do has consequences. The actions that these individuals, these criminals take have consequences.

If you assault a law enforcement officer and you are in this country illegally, you will be detained. If it is true, you should be deported. Period. No questions asked.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is common sense. It is the right thing to do. It is the American thing to do.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 7343

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 "Detain and Deport Illegal Aliens Who Assault Cops Act".

SEC. 2. DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO COMMIT ASSAULT AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "Attorney General" and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security";

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "or" and inserting a comma;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by adding "or" at the end; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

"(E)(i) is inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(A) or (C) or under section 212(a)(7); and

"(ii) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits having committed, or admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of any offense involving assault of a law enforcement officer,";

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) CIRCUMSTANCES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The circumstances referred to in paragraph (1)(E) are that the law enforcement officer was assaulted—

"(i) while he or she was engaged in the performance of his or her official duties;

"(ii) because of the performance of his or her official duties; or

"(iii) because of his or her status as a law enforcement officer.

"(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E)—

"(i) the term 'assault' has the meaning given that term in the jurisdiction where the acts occurred; and

"(ii) the term 'law enforcement officer' is a person authorized by law—

"(I) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, investigation, or prosecution, or the incarceration of any person for any criminal violation of law;

"(II) to apprehend, arrest, or prosecute an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

"(III) to be a firefighter or other first responder.

"(3) DETAINER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall issue a detainer for an alien described in paragraph (1)(E) and, if the alien is not otherwise detained by Federal, State, or local officials, shall effectively and expeditiously take custody of the alien."

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in

order except those printed in Part A of House Report 118-511. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118-511.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 3. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit a report to Congress on the number of aliens present in the United States who are inadmissible under section 212(a)(6)(A) or (C) or under section 212(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act who were detained, during the 5 year period preceding the date of the report, for committing an assault against a law enforcement officer.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, as we pause this week to recognize the men and women in law enforcement who sacrifice and serve our communities across America, it is important that we take additional steps to provide for their safety, for the protection of their colleagues, and to enhance public safety in communities across our country.

I listened intently to the debate that ensued regarding the base bill. I, for one, am interested in governing. Governing is terrifically important. I might remind my colleagues across the aisle that the Congress legislates. We adopt laws that then the executive, as part of governing, must actually enforce. What we have seen systemically over the last 4 years is this administration and this President have surrendered the southern border to drug cartels.

This administration and this President have made it easier for individuals, nearly 12 million after 4 years, to enter into our country unchecked, unvetted, and, in many cases, allowed to avoid the law.

Now, add to that, if we are to govern in this country, we not only need the President, but we need States like New York and Governors like Kathy Hochul to actually enforce the law, and yet this administration and the administration in New York are making it consistently harder for law enforcement to do their job.

New York State alone is now seeing over 200,000 undocumented individuals,

and that is in New York City alone. Why? Because New York State and New York City declared themselves sanctuary cities.

If we are to govern in this country and actually enforce the law, you would need States like New York and cities like New York to actually enforce the law, but in New York, they don't allow for the deportation of undocumented individuals even after they assault police officers. We saw this in New York City only weeks ago. Why? Because it is illegal in New York for law enforcement to interact with Federal law enforcement, ICE.

Consistently, the State of New York has been allowed to make it easier and easier for individuals not only to enter into our country illegally, but to commit crimes. New York has cashless bail.

This is a consistent effort to put people back on the streets without any intervention, without any enforcement of law, and because of it, we consistently see an increase in assaults against law enforcement and American citizens.

Eighty percent of those who are transported from the border to other cities and States across the country aren't being transported by other States, they are being transported by the President and the Federal Government.

Again, if we are to govern, the President needs to follow the law. My amendment requires a report to Congress to speak on the number of migrants who were detained for assaulting a police officer over the past 5 years. We can't actually enforce the rules if we don't have the data.

This amendment wouldn't be necessary at all if the Biden administration took actions to secure the border and States like New York didn't flaunt the law and create their own to avoid the law and make communities like mine less safe.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this amendment requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study and report to Congress on the number of undocumented immigrants detained for committing an assault against a law enforcement officer over the past 5 years.

It is important for us to take a step back and remind ourselves what the underlying legislation is about. This bill would subject even those individuals with a lawful status like DACA or temporary protected status to mandatory detention if they are merely arrested or charged with an assault on a law enforcement officer. There are no

provisions to protect those who are mistakenly arrested and are released without charges. This is an unnecessary expansion of the law, which already subjects people to mandatory detention and deportation if they admit to or are convicted of such assault.

In fact, I imagine that this report would demonstrate that the underlying legislation is wholly unnecessary because it would show that under current law people who commit assaults on law enforcement are already subject to detention. Therefore, I see no reason to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the support from my colleague across the aisle. I might remind her some moments ago she encouraged that we ought to be governing.

The problem is that Congress has adopted legislation that should be enforced at the border. Congress has established rules, as have States, to ensure that law enforcement is protected, yet States are permitted to avoid that law. Presidents like this one are permitted, apparently, to simply ignore the law.

The base legislation is necessary because we continue to see an escalation in violence against law enforcement officials, while at the same time, there is an abandonment of security at our border and the allowance of States like New York to simply avoid any responsibility for bringing criminals to justice.

The base bill is necessary. The amendment is necessary. I appreciate the support for the amendment.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this legislation has absolutely nothing to do with the border. It doesn't do anything to secure our border. It doesn't do anything to fix the broken immigration system. I don't oppose this amendment because I actually think it is going to make my point at the end of the day with the report. I don't oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 118-511.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 8, strike "or" at the end.

Page 5, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert "; or".

Page 5, insert after line 10 the following:

"(IV) to be a campus police officer or a school resource officer."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I applaud Congressman VAN DREW and his leadership on this issue and am proud to support his legislation to detain illegal immigrants who assault law enforcement.

My amendment is really straightforward and I believe in line with the goals of the underlying bill.

My amendment simply ensures that campus police officers and school resource officers are considered law enforcement officers for the purpose of the bill's provisions.

In light of the increase in violent protests on college campuses, it is especially important that we show these brave campus police officers that we have their back.

Under President Biden's watch, nearly 4.7 million illegals have been released, and more than 1.8 million known illegal alien got-aways have escaped into the United States.

In South Carolina alone, we have over 175,000 illegal aliens in my home State. These include dangerous individuals who violate our laws and then assault the law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

It is imperative that we fight back against the Biden administration's radical open-borders policy by mandating immigration detention for illegal aliens who assault law enforcement officers.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to explicitly ensure that our hardworking campus police officers and resource officers are afforded the same protections as other law enforcement officers under this legislation.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, this amendment would expand the scope of this already bad bill to include campus police and school resource officers under the term "law enforcement officers."

Unfortunately, this amendment makes a bad bill even worse while highlighting one of the many flaws in the bill.

First, the fact that Mr. NORMAN felt the need to file this amendment to begin with just highlights the lack of clarity around this bill. As we have discussed, this bill will subject any inadmissible immigrant to mandatory immigration detention for merely being arrested or charged with assault on a law enforcement officer or first responder, but the bill lacks any definition for what is considered a first responder. Mr. NORMAN was clearly concerned with this as well and felt the need to make sure that campus police

and school resource officers were included.

Unfortunately, Mr. NORMAN's amendment does not bring any additional clarity to the definition of first responder, and it even adds another undefined term, "school resource officer."

Now, Mr. NORMAN could easily have remedied this by choosing the definition that exists in title 34 of the U.S. Code, but for some reason he did not. States all over the country use different definitions for school resource officers. They have different duties and functions depending on the State, so this amendment raises far more questions than it begins to answer.

On top of the poor drafting, this amendment expands an already bad bill and makes the bill worse. As I discussed during general debate, it is quite common during protests for law enforcement to arrest an entire group of people after one person in the crowd gets unruly.

After the largely peaceful protests that we have seen on college campuses over the last month, protests made up largely of young people and teenagers, it would be a mistake to extend this definition to include campus police.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I think we have all seen the college campuses. The protests that you are talking about, many include breaking windows, knocking down doors. That is not protest. That is destruction of property. This has no place on the college campuses. To have the presidents and the tenured professors be quiet on this and to have students scared to go to class and to cancel exams, that is not what they paid money for. That is not what the taxpayers deserve.

This is very simple. If you are a resource officer, your job is to protect the students and the facilities. If you are in law enforcement on the campuses hired by the individual school, you are there to protect the campus and protect the students.

I am sick and tired of these liberals who keep saying peaceful protest. It is like the 50 cities that were burned a couple of years ago. That was not a peaceful protest. That is destruction of property and that has consequences.

All we are saying is: Give these officers the protection that law enforcement has. It shouldn't even have to be said for me to have to bring this amendment. It is a shame that we have reached this point in this country that we are having to define what a resource officer is.

□ 1500

I would ask all those who may be questioning this, you go out and volunteer to be a resource officer or sign up to be a resource officer. You go out and sign up to protect the campus, and let's see how the tables will turn.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, none of us are condoning violence on campuses. All I said is that the vast majority of protesters on campuses have been peaceful. What happens when one person does something and the entire group is arrested is relevant for this amendment. I don't think anybody believes that that should be the case.

I am not really sure why the gentleman felt the need to clarify exactly what the definition was in this underlying legislation except that it wasn't clear, which is the point that I have been making all along. The problem is that the amendment actually makes other terms unclear, as well.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 3 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY Mr. LALOTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 118–511.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 15, insert after “alien.” the following:

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall on an annual basis report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives the number of aliens described in paragraph (1)(E) who were detained in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security in the preceding year pursuant to such section.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chairman, President Biden's open border policies, notably the mass parole of unvetted migrants, have essentially turned every State into a border State and have made every community less safe.

In good faith, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my good friend, has proposed an effective bill that mandates the swift identification, detention, and deportation of illegal immigrants who commit violent acts against law enforcement. This legislation serves as a necessary corrective to the current administration's perilously lax border security.

Mr. Chairman, I am proposing an amendment to Congressman VAN DREW's bill that would further strengthen our national security framework. This amendment will compel the Secretary of Homeland Security

to systematically collect and report to Congress data on illegal migrants detained for charges or convictions of assaulting law enforcement officers.

This measure will prevent the avoidance of accountability by ensuring that Secretary Mayorkas and other officials can no longer disregard this critical data. Furthermore, it eliminates the need to depend solely on media reports to understand the full scope of violent crime linked to current border policies.

Consider, Mr. Chairman, a recent incident in Times Square, widely seen on social media, where illegal migrants violently attacked NYPD officers. Despite their arrest, these individuals were quickly released, and one was soon re-arrested for another crime. Yet, they were not deported. Instead, they received plea deals from Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg.

This pattern, where the safety of our law enforcement officers is sidelined, is becoming distressingly common. In this fiscal year alone, Mr. Chairman, Customs and Border Protection apprehended over 18,000 illegal migrants with criminal backgrounds, including 248 known gang members, 35 of whom were affiliated with MS-13.

Mr. Chair, supporting this amendment is the least we can do to bolster the safety of those who risk their lives for us every day. It is about ensuring that our approach to public safety is proactive and grounded in reality, not just wishful thinking.

As we mark National Police Week, I call on my colleagues to stand with our law enforcement officers by backing this amendment and the crucial bill introduced by Mr. VAN DREW. Let us commit to a policy that upholds the rule of law and ensures the safety of every American community. We should not put our heads in the sand and think that “see no evil, hear no evil” is an effective policy to keep our heroes safe.

During National Police Week especially, I urge all of my colleagues to support law enforcement by supporting my amendment to Congressman VAN DREW's vital underlying bill.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that the Department of Homeland Security provide an annual report to the Judiciary Committee of the House and the Senate containing the number of immigrants the Department detained as a result of this bill in that year.

Under this bill, that report would include people being detained even if a person is merely arrested and never charged or after the charges against them were dropped. It is important to remember that this bill does not in-

clude any waivers or provisions to exempt people who were mistakenly arrested or found not guilty.

I really hope that this report, if requested, will contain a breakdown of the number of people detained by category so that we could see how many innocent people were subject to mandatory detention under this bill. Right now, the amendment doesn't get into that level of detail, but I hope my colleagues across the aisle will work with me to make sure that we get all of the data that is provided, including that breakdown.

Nevertheless, while this amendment does nothing to improve the underlying legislation, it doesn't do anything to make it worse, and so I therefore see no reason to oppose it.

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

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chairman, I would welcome another amendment that would be more specific to Congress' endeavor to ensure that we have the clarity of the size and scope of this issue. My amendment is something along that path, and if the gentleman wants more, the gentleman understands that she can submit her own amendment on that issue.

Nevertheless, on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LALOTA) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 passage of the bill.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT OF 2024

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the bill (H.R. 7581) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7581

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 “Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) There has been a rise in anti-police rhetoric and a corresponding rise in violence against law enforcement officers.

(2) In 2022, a total of 60 police officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty.

(3) Nearly 30 percent of police officer killings in 2022 were caused by unprovoked attacks or ambushes on officers.

(4) Law enforcement officers bravely put themselves at risk for the betterment of society.

(5) A data collection that represents the full circumstances surrounding violent attacks and ambush attacks on law enforcement officers is vital for the provision of needed Federal resources to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

(6) Police suffer assaults and other offenses that do not rise to the level of Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted or National Incident-Based Reporting System reporting due to the frequency of such incidents, lower risk to officers, and minimal administrative resources to report such frequent events.

(7) The mental health of law enforcement officers has suffered due to overwork, recruitment issues, and the general stress of their work.

(8) The people of the United States will always remember the victims of these hateful attacks against law enforcement officers and stand in solidarity with individuals affected by these senseless tragedies and incidents of hate that have affected law enforcement communities and their families.

(9) The United States must demonstrate to its brave law enforcement officers that they are important, valued, and respected.

(10) Congress has made a commitment to helping communities protect the lives of their police officers, as evidenced by the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-155; 130 Stat. 389) and other laws.

(11) Subsection (c) of the Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act of 1988 (34 U.S.C. 41303(c))

requires the Attorney General to “acquire, collect, classify, and preserve national data on Federal criminal offenses as part of the Uniform Crime Reports” and requires all Federal departments and agencies that investigate criminal activity to “report details about crime within their respective jurisdiction to the Attorney General in a uniform matter and on a form prescribed by the Attorney General”.

SEC. 3. ATTACKS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, and the Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) the number of offenders that intentionally target law enforcement officers because of their status as law enforcement officers;

(2) the number of incidents reported to the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection that occur through the coordinated actions of 2 or more parties;

(3) a description of the Federal response to ambushes and violent attacks on Federal law enforcement officers;

(4) a detailed survey of what State and local responses are to ambushes and violent attacks on State and local law enforcement officers;

(5) recommendations for improving State, local, and Federal responses to ambushes and violent attacks on law enforcement officers;

(6) a detailed survey of Federal and State-based training programs that law enforcement officers receive in preparation for violent attacks, including ambush attacks;

(7) an analysis of the effectiveness of the programs described in paragraph (6) in preparing law enforcement officers for violent attacks, including ambush attacks;

(8) recommendations on how to improve State, local, and Federal training programs for law enforcement officers relating to ambush attacks;

(9) an analysis of, with respect to the Patrick Leahy Bulletproof Vest Partnership under part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10530 et seq.)—

(A) the efficacy of the Partnership in distributing protective gear to law enforcement officers across the United States, including any location-specific limitations to the distribution under such Partnership; and

(B) the general limitations of the Partnership, including any location-specific limitations to the distributions under the Partnership, considering the fact that law enforcement officers are suffering from ambush attacks;

(10) an analysis of the ability of the Department of Justice to combine the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection and a 09C Justifiable Homicide report for officer-involved shooting reports and any roadblocks to producing a clear report with such information;

(11) an analysis of the ability of the Criminal Justice Information Services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to expand data collection to include a suspect offender's level of injury at the time of a reported Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection incident;

(12) an analysis of the existence and extent of, and reasons for, disparities in the availability and reporting of data between—

(A) data relating to ambush attacks against law enforcement officers; and

(B) other types of violent crime data; and

(13) an analysis of any additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in deterring ambush attacks against law enforcement officers.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the report required under subsection (a), the Attorney

General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, and the Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

SEC. 4. AGGRESSION AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) an analysis of the ability to implement a new category in the Uniform Crime Reporting System and the National Incident-Based Reporting System on aggressive actions, conduct, or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are not reported in such systems;

(2) the level of detail the category described in paragraph (1) would include and the standard of evidence that would be used for any reported incidents;

(3) an analysis of how to engage State and local law enforcement agencies in reporting the data described in paragraph (1), despite the fact that such data is beyond the standard crime-based reporting to the systems described in paragraph (1);

(4) an analysis of potential uses by the Department of Justice and any component agencies of the Department of Justice of the data described in paragraph (1);

(5) an analysis of the existence and extent of, and reasons for, disparities in the availability and reporting of data between—

(A) data relating to aggressive actions or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers that do not rise to the level of crimes; and

(B) other types of violent crime data; and

(6) an analysis of additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in deterring aggressive actions, conduct, or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

SEC. 5. MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the types, frequency, and severity of mental health and stress-related responses of law enforcement officers to aggressive actions or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers;

(2) mental health and stress-related resources or programs that are available to law enforcement officers at the Federal, State, and local levels, especially peer-to-peer programs;

(3) the extent to which law enforcement officers use the resources or programs described in paragraph (2);

(4) the availability of, or need for, mental health screening within Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(5) additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in assessing, monitoring, and improving the mental health and wellness of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

(b) *DEVELOPMENT.*—In developing the report required under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academies, or other entities.

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 the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7581.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be the lead sponsor of H.R. 7581, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, and I rise in support of it.

The bill would refine and expand the gathering and analysis of data about attacks on law enforcement officers across the country, our current-day scourge. Its sponsorship is bipartisan and bicameral. I am grateful for the leadership in the Senate of Senators GRASSLEY, TILLIS, and others, and the support of 25 bipartisan cosponsors in the House.

The justification, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. Just yesterday, the FBI forecast the release of its annual report on officers assaulted and feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2023, reporting that “from 2021 to 2023, more officers were feloniously killed (194) than in any other consecutive 3-year period in the past 20 years,” and 2024 is on track to be the worst year of any, other than 2021, because a repeat criminal who should have been in jail gunned down four heroes in Charlotte 2 weeks ago and injured five others. Criminals killed 10 cops nationwide in April alone. Until the full 2023 report is released, the latest data is that over 66,000 officers were assaulted in 2022.

This bill will deepen the available dataset in three ways: Reporting on the intentionality of targeting law enforcement officers because of their status as sworn officers; tracking aggression and trauma-inducing incidents that do not rise to crime; and cataloging the availability to officers of mental health resources to deal with the attacks they suffer.

One would expect unanimous support, and yet in the Judiciary Committee, Democrats amazingly sought to gut and replace the entire bill with the same old antipolice legislation to impair qualified immunity for police officers, create a national registry of police misconduct, and require implicit bias training, and so forth.

If reacting to unprecedented killings and assaults of cops by intimidating and undermining cops sounds backwards and astonishing to you, watch the vote on this bill.

□ 1515

The truth is that the strong impulse and desire among Democrats to demonize and delegitimize police remain powerful and just under the surface, even as many of them deny they ever uttered the words “defund” and “abolish” during the 2020 summer of love, which spawned mass riots and increased attacks and killings of not only police officers but also those most in need of their protection.

Especially here in Washington, D.C., the effects of this most irresponsible rhetoric in the history of American politics have been catastrophic.

Crime remains out of control, especially among juveniles, carjackings and assaults on Congressmen, a 20-year murder record.

Congress has disapproved with Joe Biden’s signature the D.C. Council’s radical rewrite of the District’s criminal law that eliminated mandatory minimums and cut maximum sentences for most crimes.

Two D.C. Council members face recall efforts by citizens beset by violent crime, and the Metropolitan Police Department has lost almost 600 of its 4,000-member force and almost every month loses more than it hires.

Yet, some Democrats will vote against this little bill to collect more information about attacks on officers.

It must be considered under a rule because it might not get the two-thirds majority required to pass on suspension as many such little bills do.

Here, to my right, are the searing consequences of this unforgivable political division—the human cost of the worst attack on law enforcement since 2026.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department Officer Joshua Eyer, North Carolina Corrections Officers Sam Poloche and Alden Elliott, and Thomas Weeks, Jr., United States Deputy Marshal, all lost their lives on April 29.

I have been to their funerals. I have seen and heard from their families. May their names long endure in our memory.

One could list the other lives taken from us longer ago but just as strong in our memories: Jonathan Diller, NYPD officer shot and killed in March during a traffic stop, leaving behind a wife and a 1-year-old son; Philip Dale Nix, Greensboro police sergeant killed at a Sheetz gas station interdicting criminals who wanted to steal mass quantities of beer the night before New Year’s Eve; Ned Byrd, Wake County, North Carolina, sheriff’s deputy, ambushed and shot to death by illegals in 2022; Ryan Hendrix, Henderson County, North Carolina deputy, lost his life in a shoot-out with a hardened criminal wanted in multiple states; David Dorn, a 77-year-old retired police captain, fatally shot interrupting a burglary in St. Louis during the George Floyd riots in 2020; and far, far too many others to name in the time allowed. Is it time yet to come around?

The former New York City Police Commissioner, Bill Bratton, said about that place: Don’t hold your breath. The State and the city council have been captured by the progressive left, and it is unlikely that the voters are going to take them out of office anytime soon.

Let’s prove that the same cannot be said of Congress one way or the other. Support our men and women in blue—the American people certainly do, the overwhelming majority of them.

Let’s pass this little bill and develop the information necessary so that we can protect the officers who serve us, who risk their lives every day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the aisle just mischaracterized the Democratic amendment that was offered during committee, and I think if he went back and looked at the record, he would see that.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation purports to improve law enforcement officer safety and wellness. It seeks to do this by requiring the Attorney General and other Federal officials to issue reports about attacks on officers, aggression against officers, and officer mental health.

While this legislation may seem on the surface to be meaningful, let us be really clear: It is just more cheap talk from Republicans.

Absolutely nothing in this bill makes a single police officer safer or invests a single dollar in officer wellness.

While the collection of accurate data, including data on officer attacks and mental health is important, this bill is unlikely to provide any new or meaningful data.

By necessity, data about incidents of violence against law enforcement officers must already be initially collected and reported, if at all, by Tribal, State, and local authorities who are in the best position to know about these incidents, not the Attorney General.

The Federal Government collects this data through participation by

these authorities in voluntary data reporting programs like the National Incident-Based Reporting System and the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted data collection.

Nothing in this bill provides any resources for more agencies to participate in these data collection programs, nor does it mandate any kind of reporting.

Given that there is nothing in this bill to improve the underlying data that is available to the Attorney General and others, it is unlikely that the reporting required by the bill would be able to deliver any new insights that might actually improve officer safety.

Democrats sought to solve this basic problem of inadequate data collection through the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Under that bill, States would be required to report shootings, deaths, and other uses of force involving law enforcement officers, and States would receive grants to facilitate that reporting.

By both mandating and supporting data collection and reporting, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act would significantly improve the data available to the Congress, Federal agencies, and the public.

Critically, unlike this legislation, that bill would require reporting of uses of force both by and against law enforcement, enabling us to have a full understanding of the dangers faced by officers, as well as the injuries and deaths of civilians that are caused by police.

In focusing only on attacks against officers, this bill turns a blind eye to uses of force by law enforcement against civilians, whether it is justified or not.

The mental health reporting provisions of the bill are also unlikely to improve officer wellness because they fail to build on the work of past Congresses and the Biden administration.

In the 115th Congress, we passed the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act, a bipartisan bill signed into law by President Obama, which directed the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the DOJ's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to report on mental health practices and services that could be adopted by law enforcement and the programs already available to them.

It also expanded the availability of grant funds for law enforcement mental health and developed new educational resources.

Building on this work, President Biden issued a 2022 executive order on advancing effective, accountable policing and criminal justice practices to enhance public trust and public safety.

The executive order required the Attorney General to develop and publish a report on best practices to address law enforcement officer wellness and to make recommendations regarding the prevention of death by suicide of law enforcement officers.

The Attorney General has already complied with this executive order, so we already know much more about the mental health resources and the needs of law enforcement.

Rather than retread our steps, we should be moving forward to help our law enforcement officers implement this important work so that more officers can access the support that they need.

Last Congress, under Democratic control, the House passed numerous bipartisan bills that improved law enforcement officer safety and wellness like Protecting America's First Responders Act, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, the Confidentiality Opportunities for Peer Support, or COPS Counseling Act, and the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act.

At least seven bipartisan law enforcement bills, many led by Republicans, have been passed by the Democrat-led Senate.

These are bills that would help law enforcement and are priorities for the police groups, but, so far, House Republicans have only advanced one of them.

This legislation represents another wasted opportunity to work together on substantive proposals that will make our communities and the law enforcement officers that protect them safer.

I urge Members to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the comments to the gentlewoman from Washington developed, it became clear.

She said at first I mischaracterized what occurred in the Judiciary Committee, and then it became clear that I didn't mischaracterize anything.

What they offered to do was to, again, take this bill, which provides for additional data collection about attacks on law enforcement officers, to take the entire text of the bill and to gut it and replace it with, yes, indeed, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is the name, and that is the bill that I described as having attempted to impair officer qualified immunity, to require training on implicit bias, and to establish a database to impugn officers nationwide.

That is the bill that was a very top priority of Democrats when they were in the majority. It passed on the floor under their majority rule, and it went on to the Senate where it didn't advance, for good reason, because the last thing America needs—again, as demonstrated by the events in Washington, D.C., the last thing America needs is police officers to be brushed back from their jobs and to be intimidated from doing the very tough work of criminal law enforcement by legislation that antagonizes, demeans, and delegitimizes them. That is the last thing they need.

Here we are. It is remarkable. Is this the only reporting bill that has ever come up that Democrats find objectionable because of their interest in good and efficient government?

Is it that they are concerned about the possibility that the bill might not have excellent impacts or be efficient or advance the game or break new ground? What is the harm, after all?

Here is what the harm is: Democrats cannot abide by even the simplest of legislation that recognizes the burdens that are borne every day by police officers across this country on our behalf; that they are being subjected to greater and greater incidents and risk of attacks on their persons and of their deaths in the line of duty by people who intend to do them harm, and that there may be gaps in terms of the resources that are available to them to deal with the difficulties they confront.

The response that you need to do the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act in lieu of this reporting bill is absurd. It is gaslighting in the highest degree.

This little reporting bill, there is just nothing to it, and, yet, for some reason, it sticks in the craw of the minority just to say to police officers: We are going to extend further efforts, further minimal efforts to learn the information that we need to find out, to see just how big this problem is and whether you are being afforded the opportunity to deal with it in your personal lives as it wreaks havoc on you.

Joshua Eyer, Sam Poloché, Alden Elliott, Thomas Weeks, Jr.: One of the worst attacks on law enforcement ever.

Shouldn't we go and find out what we need to know for their benefit? Is that not an appropriate way, that little bill? Would that not be an appropriate way to honor their memory?

Is the concern with efficiency and breaking new ground so profound that you have to replace the bill to find out information about the assaults on them with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act that was rejected last Congress? It is simply astonishing, and Americans aren't going to tolerate it.

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

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will now control the time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me speak more directly to the circumstances in Washington, D.C., and what has transpired as a consequence of exactly the kind of policing bill represented by the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which the minority proposed in the Judiciary Committee to gut and replace this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, do you know why our Democratic colleagues oppose this report? Do you know why, Madam Speaker? They don't want clear, fresh, precise data provided to the American people on how many attacks uniformed law officers suffer every year.

They don't want America to know, Madam Speaker, because America

would be shocked. It is vastly under-reported by rank-and-file officers like me and my brothers and sisters from sea to shining sea, men who know what it is not just to wear a little pin like here and walk around D.C. with your head held high, but to wear a shield, to wear a badge, to earn that certification every year. We know what it is to be constantly under threat of attack and physical attack, but we carry on.

We rarely report what we don't absolutely have to because of the agenda-driven persecution that officers are currently facing. Where? In Republican-run cities with Republican district attorneys that actually prosecute criminals? No, Madam Speaker. In liberal cities.

Look at the maps. It is in cities run by Democratic policies and the agendas of the Democratic mayors and Democratic DAs. Those are the cities that are eaten alive by crime in America. This is why you cannot fill the ranks of law enforcement officers across the country.

When I was a cop, we had about 800,000 uniformed officers. We were on our way to a million. We are down to about 600,000 now. Your officers are leaving service not because of the threats that we have historically faced but because of the threats that we continue to face for physical danger on the streets and the very significant possibility, even probability in some municipalities, that the actions of that law enforcement officer are going to be treated more harshly than the criminal and violent attacks that the officer both faces and protects his community from.

To think that my colleagues across the aisle would oppose a bill that mandates the Department of Justice provide accurate data to the American people about how many violent attacks uniformed officers face across the country, my God, you can barely get your head wrapped around that.

Of course, this body that is supposed to represent we the people should endeavor to provide the American people with accurate, contemporary data regarding such things.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to support my colleague's bill, and I encourage Representatives on both sides of the aisle to join us in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think it bears repeating, in light of that extraordinary commentary, that right here in the District of Columbia, to the affliction of 700,000, roughly, local citizens and the 19 million who visit annually, exactly the kind of radical politicization that would say this reporting bill is beyond the pale and that you have to have the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. That is exactly what they did in D.C. That is exactly what they have

done to lead to citizen-led recall petitions on two D.C. councilmembers, what they have done to see carjackings explode in ways that no one ever thought possible, to have a 20-year record of homicides last year, and to have one D.C. councilmember still touting that he managed, because of the budget politics, to take millions and millions out of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department so that their force has declined from 4,000 by 600 or more and continues to decline 3 years into the phenomenon.

How far will ideology go to take us beyond common sense to a point we can't recover? Let's do a little reporting bill and find out the details. Let's get a rich dataset about this scourge that we see across the Nation precipitated and encouraged by those who still cannot bring themselves to say that law enforcement officers are a needed quantity, that the Nation must have them, that law and order must prevail in order for the country to succeed.

How could we have come to a point in the country where that cannot be conceded readily by everyone in the political spectrum? I do not know. I do not understand, but that is where we are.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this bill is more cheap talk from Republicans. Nothing in this bill makes a single officer safer or invests a single dollar in officer wellness.

This legislation falls far short of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which would invest in better data collection and reporting by requiring law enforcement agencies to report uses of force by or against law enforcement officers as a condition of the receipt of certain grants.

House Republicans are, again, refusing to work with police and the organizations that represent the police to pass meaningful legislation. This legislation is a missed opportunity. It calls for a report that duplicates existing reporting requirements.

It falls far short of meaningful progress in officer safety, and it represents an enormous step backward from the legislation offered by the Democratic majority in the 117th Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation so that we can work together on bipartisan legislation that will really enhance the safety of our officers and our communities.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, cheap talk. That is what the gentleman from New York just said: cheap talk. Madam Speaker, there is nothing cheap about it. Behold the price.

That is why when this body, when this Republican House, undertook to

disapprove the D.C. crime bill that would have radically rewritten criminal law in the District of Columbia, this body disapproved it with the support of over 30 Democrats. That is why CHUCK SCHUMER and the Democratic majority in the Senate joined in disapproving that radical rewrite of the criminal law in the District of Columbia. That is why Joe Biden signed the law to disapprove the radical rewrite of the criminal law in D.C.

What is cheap talk is the concern that this would produce a duplicate report. That is the objection, that the report might be duplicative? Really?

I would take duplicative reports from here to kingdom come if there is the slightest chance that it will avoid this unspeakable price. Everybody in the Chamber should support the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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 passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONDEMNING THE BIDEN BORDER CRISIS AND THE TREMENDOUS BURDENS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FACE AS A RESULT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1210) condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1210

Whereas the Biden administration brazenly eliminated effective and lawful Trump administration immigration enforcement policies, directly leading to the worst border crisis in the history of the Nation and affecting every State;

Whereas the Biden administration's failed border policies have resulted in an exponential rise in illegal alien encounters, totaling more than 9,300,000 in less than 4 years;

Whereas over 1,800,000 known “gotaways” have crossed the border illegally and evaded apprehension, with the administration having no idea of their identity, whereabouts, or intent;

Whereas at least 362 individuals on the terrorist watch list have been apprehended trying to illegally enter the country between ports of entry since fiscal year 2021;

Whereas fentanyl and other synthetic opioids are pouring into the United States, forcing local police departments to issue naloxone, a lifesaving medication used to reverse opioid overdoses, to every officer;

Whereas the suffering endured by the American people from the unprecedented rise in dangerous crime and historic levels of drug-related deaths is the direct result of an unsecured border;

Whereas elected Democrats from Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Texas, and Washington, DC, have declared states of emergency as a result of the border crisis;

Whereas Democrat-led sanctuary cities have slashed city budgets, including funding for law enforcement;

Whereas law enforcement officers in the United States have suffered through calls by politicians and activists to “defund the police” and are now suffering from historically low levels of recruitment and morale as a result of these attacks to their profession;

Whereas migrant gangs, such as the violent Venezuelan gang Tren de Aragua, actively recruit newly arrived illegal aliens into theft rings and criminal networks;

Whereas New York City Police Department Commissioner Edward Caban has warned New Yorkers of a “wave of migrant crime”, and Democrat Mayor Eric Adams has claimed the migrant crisis will “destroy New York City”;

Whereas, on February 23, 2024, Venezuelan national Jose Antonio Ibarra was arrested and charged with the murder of 22-year-old student Laken Riley;

Whereas Ibarra entered the country illegally in September 2022 and was subsequently released by U.S. Customs and Border Protection into the interior;

Whereas, on March 2, 2024, an illegal alien, who entered the United States as a “gotaway” at an unknown time and location, allegedly struck and killed Washington State Trooper Christopher Gadd;

Whereas a Haitian national who entered the United States via the unlawful Cuban, Haitian, Nicaraguan, and Venezuelan parole program, was arrested on March 13, 2024, for the sexual assault of a 15-year-old girl at an illegal alien shelter in Massachusetts;

Whereas an illegal alien from Lebanon apprehended while illegally crossing the southwest border on March 9, 2024, admitted to being a Hezbollah terrorist and having intentions to make a bomb;

Whereas, on March 21, 2024, illegal aliens in El Paso rushed the border fence and Texas National Guard troops in an effort to breach the border into the United States;

Whereas a previously deported illegal alien was charged on March 23, 2024, with murdering 25-year-old Michigan resident Ruby Garcia;

Whereas, on March 27, 2024, an illegal alien from China illegally breached a military base in California and refused to leave;

Whereas, on January 27, 2024, 2 New York City Police Department officers were assaulted by more than a dozen illegal alien suspects in Times Square, many of whom were set free without bail; and

Whereas law enforcement officers are increasingly targeted and assaulted by illegal aliens while Democrat elected officials prioritize illegal alien criminals over citizens and legal residents of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges that United States law enforcement officers are bravely facing dangers and challenges every day that are exacerbated by the unprecedented crisis at the border, which affects the entire country;

(2) condemns the open border crisis that President Joe Biden, “Border Czar” Vice President Kamala Harris, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas, and other Biden administration officials have willingly created along the southwest border;

(3) urges the Biden administration, and State and local elected officials, to encourage and support dedicated law enforcement officers so those officers can protect the homeland, their cities, counties, or States, and restore law and order; and

(4) recognizes and sympathizes with law enforcement officers in the United States who have suffered through the mental, physical, and psychological stress associated with the lack of support, trust, and respect they face in our country today.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 1210.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1210 comes before us as thousands of frontline law enforcement officers come here to this Capitol to ask for our help to restore a justice system that was once the envy of the world but, in recent years, has been undermined by woke district attorneys who refuse to enforce our laws, woke city councils that insult and defund our law enforcement, and woke Federal officials who refuse to secure our border, which is becoming an increasing source of deadly drugs, terrorists, criminal gangs, and criminal cartels that illegally cross our borders daily.

Just a week ago, I noted on this floor that on the first day that Joe Biden took office, he rescinded the successful remain in Mexico policy that had slowed phony asylum claims to a trickle, completely blocked completion of the border wall, and ordered ICE to stop enforcing court-ordered deportations. Thus began the largest illegal mass migration in history.

□ 1545

I need to update the numbers this week that I cited last week. To date,

this administration has now deliberately released a total of 4.9 million illegal aliens into our communities, and it has allowed another 1.9 million known got-aways to evade Border Patrol as the Border Patrol has been overwhelmed.

With the new numbers combined, there are nearly 6.8 million illegal aliens who have entered this country because of the Democrats’ open-border policies. That is a population larger than the entire State of Indiana, our 17th largest State, with nine Congressional Districts.

Now, I expect the Democrats will complain that we are bringing up yet another measure condemning these policies. Well, I have news for them. They need to get used to it. We are going to keep bringing it up until these policies are reversed or until the people can elect an administration that can and will.

I suspect we will hear the Democrats today, as we have on so many past debates, assert that immigrants are more law-abiding than Americans. Well, listen carefully to what they say. They make no distinction between legal immigrants and illegal immigrants, and that is a supreme insult to the millions of legal immigrants who enter our country every year by obeying our laws, waiting patiently in line, and doing everything our country asks of them. Legal immigrants come here, pledge to pull their weight, not to be a burden on others, to obey our laws, and to love and defend our country.

Illegal immigrants come here under very different circumstances. Their first act is to commit a Federal crime by illegally entering our country. Their second act is to demand free food, shelter, medical care, clothing, education, transportation, and legal services.

I have watched them at the border taunting our Border Patrol as they illegally cross into our country. To equate their lawless behavior with law-abiding, hardworking, and patriotic legal immigrants is an outrage, and my colleagues who do so should be ashamed of themselves.

The number of terrorist suspects the Border Patrol has encountered has ballooned exponentially, and law enforcement officials are warning that among the 1.9 million known got-aways—mostly single military-aged men—is likely a dangerous fifth column which could soon launch devastating attacks within our borders.

Fentanyl brought in through the open border is killing hundreds of Americans every day.

Democrats’ sanctuary policies hamstring attempts to deport criminal illegal aliens. Worst of all, the admission of untold thousands of the most vicious gang members on the planet are now producing a terrible butcher’s bill of murders and assaults upon Americans.

Their contention that illegal immigrants are more law-abiding is simply gaslighting.

Here are the real numbers. When the Federation for American Immigration Reform looked at the actual numbers reported by State prisons in order to get reimbursement from the Federal Government, they discovered the tragic truth. Now, again, these are the requests States make to be reimbursed for the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens, and those numbers reveal that aliens are 231 percent more likely to be jailed for crimes in California, 440 percent more likely in New Jersey, and 60 percent more likely in Texas. Just to name a few.

Madam Speaker, aliens are 231 percent more likely to be jailed in California according to their own SCAAP numbers. You won't find that anywhere else because it is illegal in California to otherwise report the immigration status of criminals and criminal suspects, so by their criteria, not a single crime is ever committed by illegals in California, yet at the same time they report their jails are overflowing.

This is lunacy, and it has got to stop.

Our law enforcement officers know this because they deal with this crisis every day at the peril of their own lives. Our angel families know this all too well, as they grieve their loved ones lost to this entirely preventable tragedy.

Now, the House can and has written laws that will make it easier for future Presidents like President Trump to secure our borders and make it harder for future Presidents like Joe Biden to open them, but ultimately, this is an enforcement problem.

When I visited with the Border Patrol agents in Yuma last year, I reminded them that Congress writes laws but cannot enforce them. I asked them what laws they needed us to write, and they unanimously answered: We don't need new laws; we need to enforce our existing laws. When Republicans visited Eagle Pass in January, the sector chief there said: I am standing in front of an open fire hydrant with a bucket. I don't need more buckets. I need somebody to turn off the hydrant.

Donald Trump did that, and despite vicious opposition from the Democrats, he finally got that hydrant down to a dribble. Biden opened it full force with his first executive acts that he signed. That is a problem that can only be fixed by replacing this administration with one determined to secure our border, defend our country, protect our people, and uphold the rule of law. That can only be done by the American people at the ballot box.

Until then, Republicans in the House will keep raising this issue at every opportunity because at the moment that is all that we can do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my Republican colleagues like to talk a big game when it comes to immigration and border secu-

rity. They have a long list of grievances against the Biden administration and a lot of tough talk about what should be done, but when it actually comes to doing something about it, doing the hard work of legislating and finding meaningful solutions to real problems, that is where they come up short.

Instead, they resort to bringing up completely meaningless nonbinding resolutions that allow them to shake their fists and to demonize immigrants for a little while, accomplishing absolutely nothing.

They can't even manage to bring up a simple resolution honoring law enforcement officers during Police Week. They have to turn everything into a broadside against the Biden administration and an excuse to play politics on immigration.

For the fourth time in 5 months, Republicans are bringing forth an empty resolution that will do absolutely nothing to address the situation at the border or to repair our broken immigration system.

They have completely given up on developing solutions because Donald Trump told them that he wanted to preserve the issue for the upcoming election. He wanted the issue, and he did not want them to solve the problem, so they walked away from a bipartisan deal negotiated by one of the most conservative Members of the Senate.

Instead, all they have to offer is meaningless resolution after meaningless resolution, each one a useless rehash of the last.

Like the others, this one recycles misleading statistics and constructs a false narrative while accomplishing nothing. That would be bad enough, but it also includes language that is false and downright offensive, such as, "Democrat elected officials prioritize illegal alien criminals over citizens and legal residents of the United States." That is an outrageous assertion that is beneath the dignity of this House. We can have honest debates about policy, but questioning our loyalty to the American people is a disgusting slander and should be an embarrassment to anyone who supports this resolution.

Madam Speaker, we know that the best way to secure the border is to expand legal pathways and to adequately fund the immigration system. We have not updated our legal immigration system in 30 years. The more broken the legal immigration system is, the more people will try to come to the border as the only means of entry.

Because Republicans refuse to support President Biden's supplemental funding request, we don't have the resources we need to secure the border and to provide additional support for communities receiving migrants.

We need more Border Patrol agents, more immigration judges, and more asylum officers so that asylum cases can be heard in weeks, not years. The Republicans talk about catch and re-

lease, but that is because the asylum cases take years. If we funded what the President requested for more immigration judges, more asylum officers, not to mention more Border Patrol agents, asylum cases would be heard in weeks, not years, and you wouldn't have this catch and release problem.

We need more CBP officers and new detection technology to counter fentanyl. We need to modernize our ports of entry to combat the smuggling of people and drugs. Unfortunately, when it comes to providing the resources necessary to address these critical needs, Republicans have consistently voted "no." If there is a non-binding resolution full of demagoguery and fearmongering, then they are the first in line to support it.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. We must do better.

I urge Members to oppose this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I would remind my friend that the bill that he keeps boasting about would tie the hands of any future President to use existing law to secure our border as President Trump did until illegal crossings reach 4,000 a day. That is what they refer to when they praise the Senate bill as the strongest border bill in decades, a bill that would make it impossible to do what Donald Trump did with our existing laws.

Those laws didn't change on Inauguration Day. The President changed, and the new President reversed the policies of the Trump administration and introduced this terrible crisis upon our country.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), the author of this resolution.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution that I have authored and introduced and will be considered on the House floor.

I am going to calmly suggest my colleagues across the aisle reassess their position on this resolution because they are speaking of Republican majorities walking away from what they allege is a strong immigration reform and border security bill. That bill was not the border security bill that we passed through this House, H.R. 2, which was the strongest legislative measure in the history of Congress. It has been walked away from by the Democrat-controlled Senate. H.R. 2 is condemned by your President, President Biden.

You know who also did not universally like H.R. 2, Madam Speaker? The cartels. My colleagues across the aisle may want to wonder, how do you find yourselves aligned with the cartels? Oh, let us review.

Since day one of this administration, since January of 2021, the policies of our executive branch were flipped to be more receptive to illegal immigration, and in doing so, more aligned with the

cartels' operations of trafficking human beings and drugs into our country.

Anyone with two brain cells that may occasionally bump into each other would realize that if you soften your existing law enforcement on illegal immigration when on the other side of the border the territory is 100 percent controlled by criminal cartels who are trafficking two things, human beings and drugs, what do you think might happen? Of course, you are going to have a drastic increase in trafficked human beings and drugs, which is exactly where we are.

Republicans took action in the first few months that we had majority control. We went through exhaustive legislative measures to battle through the language of H.R. 2. We went through an 18-hour markup in the Homeland Security Committee, my committee. We brought H.R. 2 to the floor, and it was passed with all Republicans supporting that bill. It went to the Senate, and there it remains gathering dust, Madam Speaker.

□ 1600

Madam Speaker, we had countless efforts to communicate with our colleagues in the Senate, encouraging them: Take up the bill. If you disagree with H.R. 2, then, by all means, debate and change, amend and pass your version, and send it back to the House.

When we go to conference, that is the way things work, but that is not the way it happened in the Senate. The Democrat-controlled Senate killed H.R. 2 which was a legitimate and strong response to the invasion that we have faced at our southern border.

My resolution simply acknowledges and condemns the loss of our sovereign control at the southern border and the impact that this wave upon human wave of misery, drugs, and human trafficking has brought upon our country and the impact upon local and State law enforcement who has had to bear the full brunt of the Biden administration policies, Madam Speaker.

These are policies that can be flipped very quickly.

You put me in charge of our border policy, and you will find out what happens with cartel operations. They are going to have to take some of those trillions of dollars they stole from us trafficking in the misery of human beings who have been caught up in their pipeline and sold their horrible tale of coming to America and prospering. They were sold a story by the cartels, and they were caught up in that trafficking.

How is that trafficking allowed?

It is because the doors were opened, and the borders were opened. By what? By lack of money?

No. It was by change in policy from the executive branch.

Local and State law enforcement, Madam Speaker, has had to deal with that. Those men and women have suffered. Those departments have suf-

fered. They have been forced into crisis not by their own communities where they live and serve, but by executive policies of this Federal Government.

My resolution is not meaningless, I say to my colleague across the aisle. It is quite the opposite. It acknowledges the service and sacrifice of the men and women who wear a badge at the local and State levels across our country who have been horribly impacted by the Biden administration policies at our southern border which have brought generational trauma upon our country and an era of misery we may never forget.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak for this amount of time.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I do find it interesting that the arguments are consistently wrong from my colleagues across the aisle.

First of all, now they are telling us: Oh, it is just money. They need more money.

Yet, overwhelmingly, everybody on that side of the aisle voted for the continuing resolutions that came up last year. There wasn't one of them who said: Let's amend the CR and get more money.

No. They didn't do that. They said: We are going to rely instead on this bogus bill that is going to come from the Senate.

Now, the bogus bill from the Senate that they now love and embrace, why do they embrace it?

It is because it has a few things in it that are really unique. Number one, every day 1,500 people have to be allowed in. Not legally, because we allow over 1 million people in legally, they have to be let in if they are here illegally. Well, 1,500 would be an improvement for sure because we are looking at 3 million this year, and that would only be about over one-half a million.

I can understand why they would say that that is an improvement. The reality is that the President has authority now to act and has chosen not to act. This bill from the Senate would have said that he could close the border when the number got to 5,000 a day. That was an option, 5,000. Good grief, that is over 1.8 million.

By the way, that would still be an improvement over what the Biden policy is today.

The mandatory closure of the border doesn't kick in until 7,500 illegal aliens are encountered. Wow, that is what they say is so great.

The other thing they like about it is it granted amnesty. That is what they really liked about this. We know right now President Biden could close that border right now today if he would change the policy.

To what, one might say?

How about back to the policies of his predecessor, Donald Trump?

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. The Yuma sector is a good-sized sector along the border. The entire last year of Donald Trump's Presidency, the encounters were a little under 8,000 for the whole year.

Do you know what they get every day now, Mr. Speaker? And this is down. They get 350 a day.

There have been days that I have been in Yuma where they have had 2,500 to 3,000 a day. Last week I was down at the border, and the week before that I was down at the border at different places in Arizona. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Arizona is on track to going from 2018 through 2020, 60,000 encounters a year on average. This year it will be over 700,000 encounters.

The number one drug trafficking and human trafficking corridor is the Tucson sector. When I was there just 2 weeks ago driving along the border, there were no Border Patrol agents.

Why is that, you might say, because you could go for miles?

It was because every agent was processing the illegal aliens who had crossed during the night. There were hundreds, and we are supposed to say: Well, do you know what? This is a meaningless resolution.

It is not a meaningless resolution. It gets at the heart of the matter.

Who is being impacted by this type of diaspora?

Every country in the world is represented. I have talked to people from all over the world, and let me just tell you this, Mr. Speaker, if you go down to the little town of Sierra Vista in Cochise County, not too far from the border, about 20,000, 25,000 people live there. They have multiple high-speed car chases every week. Why?

It is because the cartels control the southern border. They Snapchat and they Instagram to kids in Tucson high schools, Chandler high schools, and Mesa high schools up in my district who will go down and borrow their mom and dad's car.

They will go down, and they say: Come meet us at this mile marker, and you will have four bodies. You will get paid \$1,000 to \$2,000 a body. You take them up to I-8 and I-10, drop them off at this mile marker, or you take them to an address in Phoenix to a drop house. Whatever you do, don't stop.

These kids are as young as 13, fatality drivers, who drive at high speeds through a town of 25,000 people. That is the impact that our local law enforcement and our local people feel.

How about the city of Yuma?

There is one hospital, a 10-bed ER and a 10-bed maternity ward, and it is oftentimes filled with illegal aliens. Locals have to be air-vacked to San Diego or Phoenix. That is real. My friends can dance around it all they want, but this is why this is not a meaningless resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I support it, and I encourage my friends to do the same.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close if the gentleman from New York is.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the Senate bill, that it wasn't strong enough. It was strong enough so that Senator MCCONNELL supported it. Senator LANKFORD, one of the most conservative Senators in the Senate, supported it.

It was going to pass until President Trump said: I don't want this problem solved. I want an issue for the election.

Then suddenly it was stopped.

Then we are told about H.R. 2. H.R. 2 was such a terrible bill that it couldn't get more than 32 votes in the Senate, a Senate with 49 Republican Senators. So don't tell me about H.R. 2.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is cloaked in language ostensibly honoring law enforcement, but it is really just another excuse for Republicans to play politics with the southern border and to sound tough without actually doing anything. I am glad that the kind of thing they are talking about doing isn't being done.

They say: Turn back to President Trump.

President Trump separated thousands of children from their parents, little children, many whom even today cannot be identified and returned to their parents. I don't think this country wants a return to that kind of policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this pointless resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I have to remind my friend that the Senate could not pass its bill. The House passed our bill, and the difference is stark. As I said, the Senate bill forbids any future President from using the powers that Donald Trump used to secure our borders until illegal crossings reached 4,000 a day.

He is not required to take any action until they reach 5,000 a day, and even then he must still allow 1,500 illegal crossings every day. That is the Democrats' idea of border security, and it is a farce.

This debate encapsulates the differences between the two parties on this issue, and they are absolutely jarring. I don't need to characterize it; it speaks for itself. The American people can clearly see the difference and will need to make the most important choice of their lifetimes in just a few months.

I would simply ask: How do we make our streets safer by making it all but impossible to deport illegal aliens as the law requires?

That is what our sanctuary cities are doing.

How do we make our families safer by flooding our communities with deadly fentanyl?

How do we make our children safer by refusing to vet every person who enters our country so that we can keep the criminals out?

How do we make our neighborhoods safer by refusing to prosecute criminal illegal aliens to the fullest extent of the law?

How do we make our highways safer by creating the conditions of deadly high-speed chases and drunk driving?

How do we protect our country as untold numbers of terrorists enter among the 1.9 million known got-aways who have entered under Joe Biden's nose?

How do we make our communities safer as criminal gangs and criminal cartels set up shop in our cities for their lethal business of child trafficking, drug trafficking, extortion, and crime?

These are the questions that have gone unanswered since this administration took office and with which our local law enforcement officials must grapple every day at the peril of their own lives in order to protect ours.

It is time we thanked them for their service and their sacrifice and put the full might and fury of our Nation behind the defense of our national borders. That is what this resolution calls for. However, one thing more will be needed that Congress cannot provide, and that is a new administration.

Let us pray it comes in time to save our country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1615

D.C. CRIMINAL REFORMS TO IMMEDIATELY MAKE EVERYONE SAFE ACT OF 2024

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1227, I call up the bill (H.R. 7530) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing

criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7530

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 "D. C. Criminal Reforms to Immediately Make Everyone Safe Act of 2024" or the "DC CRIMES Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. YOUTH OFFENDERS.

(a) *LIMITING YOUTH OFFENDER STATUS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO INDIVIDUALS 18 YEARS OF AGE OR YOUNGER.*—Section 2(6) of the Youth Rehabilitation Act of 1985 (sec. 24-901(6), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking "24 years of age or younger" and inserting "18 years of age or younger".

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—

(1) *REPEAL CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUALS 18 THROUGH 24 YEARS OF AGE IN STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FACILITIES, TREATMENT, AND SERVICES.*—Section 3(a-1) of such Act (sec. 24-902(a-1), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) *COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR INDIVIDUALS UNDER ORDER OF PROBATION.*—Section 4(a)(2) of such Act (sec. 24-903(a)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking "15 to 24 years of age" and inserting "15 to 18 years of age15 to 18 years of age".

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF WEBSITE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE CRIME STATISTICS.

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION.*—Subchapter I of chapter 23 of title 16, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§16-2340a. Website of updated statistics on juvenile crime

"(a) *ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF WEBSITE.*—The Attorney General of the District of Columbia shall establish and operate a publicly accessible website which contains data on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, including each of the following statistical measures:

"(1) *The total number of juveniles arrested each year.*

"(2) *The total number and percentage of juveniles arrested each year, broken down by age, race, and sex.*

"(3) *Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage arrested for petty crime, including the following crimes:*

"(A) *Vandalism.*

"(B) *Theft.*

"(C) *Shoplifting.*

"(4) *Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage arrested for crime of violence (as defined in section 23-1331(4)).*

"(5) *Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage who were arrested for their first offense.*

"(6) *Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the total number and percentage who had been arrested previously.*

"(7) *Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year who had been arrested previously, the total number and percentage of the number of arrests.*

“(8) Of the total number of juveniles arrested each year, the declination rate for prosecutions by the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

“(9) Of the total number of juveniles sentenced each year, the number and percentage who were tried as adults.

“(10) Of the total number of juveniles prosecuted each year, the number and percentage who were not sentenced, who were sentenced to a misdemeanor, and who were sentenced to a felony.

“(11) Of the total number of juveniles sentenced each year, the number and percentage of the length of time that will be served in a correctional facility as provided by the sentence.

“(b) **UPDATES.**—The Attorney General shall update the information contained on the website on a monthly basis.

“(c) **MAINTAINING ARCHIVE OF INFORMATION.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information contained on the website is archived appropriately to provide indefinite public access to historical data of juvenile arrests and prosecutions.

“(d) **FORMAT.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information contained in the website, including historical data described in subsection (c), is available in a machine-readable format available for bulk download.

“(e) **PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Attorney General shall ensure that the website does not include any juvenile's personally identifiable information.

“(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘crime’ has the meaning given the term ‘offense’ in section 23-1331(2); and

“(2) the term ‘juvenile’ has the meaning given the term ‘youth offender’ in section 2(6) of the Youth Rehabilitation Act of 1985 (sec. 24-901(6), D.C. Official Code).”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AUTHORIZED RELEASE OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **JUVENILE CASE RECORDS OF FAMILY COURT.**—Section 16-2331, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

“(i) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in juvenile case records to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16-2340a.”

(2) **JUVENILE SOCIAL RECORDS OF FAMILY COURT.**—Section 16-2332, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

“(h) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in juvenile social records to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16-2340a.”

(3) **POLICE AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT RECORDS.**—Section 16-2333, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a person shall provide information contained in law enforcement records and files concerning a child to the Attorney General for purposes of the website established and operated under section 16-2340a.”

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The Attorney General of the District of Columbia shall establish the website under section 16-2341, District of Columbia Official Code, as added by subsection (a), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITING COUNCIL FROM ENACTING CHANGES TO EXISTING CRIMINAL LIABILITY SENTENCES.

Section 602(a) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-206.02(a), D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) enact any act, resolution, or rule to change any criminal liability sentence in effect on the date of the enactment of the DC CRIMES Act of 2024.”

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 Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7530, the DC CRIMES Act.

The Committee on Oversight and Accountability has held three hearings with D.C. officials. Many members of the committee have met privately with various D.C. officials to discuss the crime crisis in our Nation's Capital.

Throughout this work, one thing has been made abundantly clear: The progressive policies of the District of Columbia City Council are simply not working.

Last year, the Congress successfully blocked the D.C. Council's Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 by passing the bipartisan H.J. Res. 26, the first law passed by the 118th Congress. That was a great first step toward addressing the rising crime in D.C., but that only kept the problem from getting much worse.

The bill we are considering today expands upon that work. The DC CRIMES Act overturns targeted portions of the D.C. Council's Youth Rehabilitation Act by amending the definition of a youth offender from a person under the age of 25 to under the age of 18.

Let me restate: The DC CRIMES Act overturns the targeted portions of the D.C. Council's Youth Rehabilitation Act by amending the definition of a youth offender from somebody under the age of 25 to under the age of 18.

Currently, D.C. Code allows a criminal under the age of 25 to be given the same leniency that is afforded to mi-

nors. This bill requires that we treat adult criminals as adults like the rest of the country does.

As juvenile crime soars throughout the District, the bill also requires the D.C. attorney general to create a publicly available website that tracks juvenile crime data. This data will inform Congress, the District's elected officials, the Metropolitan Police Department, the public, and others about the severity of juvenile crime in the District of Columbia.

Finally, the bill prohibits the D.C. Council from amending its sentencing and criminal liability laws, locking into place the current D.C. criminal law and leaving Congress as the sole authority to amend such laws in the future.

The D.C. Council would have succeeded in implementing radical soft-on-crime policies if it were not for the bipartisan effort of this Congress to disapprove of the D.C. Council's legislation. Even Democratic Mayor Muriel Bowser vetoed the progressive criminal reform package, only for her veto to be overturned by the D.C. City Council.

The Committee on Oversight and Accountability is committed to its constitutional responsibility to oversee the District of Columbia. We cannot allow further pro-crime policies to be put into place while this crisis continues.

Citizens of D.C. and the visitors of our Nation's Capital deserve to feel safe. This bill is a great step toward ensuring our Capital City is going to be safe.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I start by humbly suggesting that the majority needs someone new working on legislative acronyms for these messaging bills. This is the DC CRIMES Act, which stands for the D.C. Criminal Reforms to Immediately Make Everyone Safe Act of 2024.

“Immediately make everyone safe.” That doesn't sound like legislation. It sounds like a Penn & Teller magic trick to me.

If the gentleman from Florida can actually immediately make everyone safe, the gentleman should not only be Donald Trump's running mate, as I keep hearing about, but the gentleman should be the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

The D.C. Criminal Reforms to Immediately Make Everyone Safe Act is the fourth bill that the majority has brought to the floor to vilify, heckle, and micromanage the elected Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia on the appalling conceit that the distinguished Members of the Republican Conference from Florida or Kentucky or Arizona care more about public safety and public welfare in Washington, D.C., than do the 700,000 people who

live there and their elected officials on the D.C. Council and the Mayor.

This one is even more sweeping and radical than their prior bills. It doesn't simply overturn one specific current D.C. law. It permanently strips D.C. of authority over any of its criminal laws, making this legislation, perhaps inadvertently, I concede, the largest proposed rollback of D.C.'s authority to govern itself in nearly 30 years.

Our colleagues may be shocked to learn during this debate what exactly it is they are being asked to vote for today. At the Rules Committee meeting yesterday, I asked the Republican Members whether they understood what this bill actually does if you take the time to read the language. None of them seemed to know.

Let me explain. The bill amends the D.C. Home Rule Act to say that the D.C. Council may not "enact any act, resolution, or rule to change any criminal . . . sentence in effect on the date of the enactment of the DC CRIMES Act of 2024."

In other words, if this bill becomes law, the D.C. Council could never increase criminal penalties again without Congress acting first, nor could it create any new criminal offenses at all.

This is their big tough-on-crime package the majority offers the Congress: No increases in criminal sentences indefinitely in the District of Columbia, and no new offenses can be passed at all.

Say the D.C. Council wanted to create a new criminal offense for directing an organized retail theft ring. Mr. DONALDS' bill would prevent them from doing it.

Say D.C. wanted to make it a crime to possess a firearm with a removed or altered or mutilated serial number. Under Mr. DONALDS' bill, they would be barred from doing so.

In fact, that is precisely what D.C. just did a few months ago. My Republican colleagues seem blissfully oblivious to the fact that, earlier this year, responding to the spike in crime occurring across America—not just in Washington, D.C., of course—the D.C. Council passed a 63-page law called the Secure DC Omnibus Emergency Amendment Act of 2024, which dramatically increased criminal penalties for nine different crimes and created six new criminal offenses.

The D.C. bill, which was passed unanimously by the council and signed into law by the Mayor, does what Republicans have so eloquently been orating about on the floor. It increased criminal penalties, including for gun crimes, violence in parks, violence committed against vulnerable people, and violence committed against rideshare drivers, Metro drivers, and transit workers.

The Secure DC Omnibus Emergency Amendment Act also created a host of new offenses, including directing a retail theft ring, strangulation, firing bullets in public, possessing a firearm with a removed or altered serial num-

ber, and unlawful discarding of firearms or ammunition.

They addressed the actual problems that they are experiencing in their city, something our colleagues seriously know nothing about and don't care about. If Mr. DONALDS' bill had actually been law at the time, the D.C. Council would have been barred from enacting all of these tough-on-crime penalties altogether, and they will be barred in the future from responding to the kinds of spikes in crime that they experience.

Amazingly, the gentleman proposes this naked power grab against Washington, denying them the crime-fighting tools they need, despite the fact that they have done a good job and total crime in D.C. is down 16 percent in 2024 compared to the same period last year, which was conceded by the Republicans in the Rules Committee yesterday.

There has been a 26-percent reduction in violent crime in 2024, which they conceded in the Rules Committee yesterday, and a 22-percent reduction in homicides.

In other words, local democracy works. Let the local governments respond to the problems they are having, but our colleagues insist that crime is still spiking in D.C., despite the evidence to the contrary.

What is their big tough-on-crime solution? The bold solution Republicans offer us to combat crime in the Nation's Capital is to prohibit the D.C. Council from ever increasing any criminal penalties and blocking the D.C. Council from ever creating any new crimes.

If that is not what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle intend to do, then I think my colleagues need to go back and try again with some new legislation.

In any event, for my Republican colleagues who love to castigate the people of D.C., who I concede voted more than 90 percent against Donald Trump in the last election, I would respectfully suggest that the majority considers the following fact: D.C. has higher maximum criminal penalties than many Republican States do. Let's compare.

The maximum penalty for armed robbery in D.C. is 30 years. In Kentucky, represented by the chairman of the Oversight Committee, the maximum is 20 years, 50 percent less. In North Dakota, it is 10 years, or 66 percent less.

In D.C., criminals can receive a 40-year sentence for armed carjacking. In Kentucky, represented by the chairman of the Oversight Committee, carjacking is not a separate independent offense. You have to charge somebody with armed robbery, but even then, you can only get half the sentence you can get in D.C. for carjacking.

Despite all of the fine election-year rhetoric we have heard, there is something profoundly antithetical to our system of government in what the gen-

tleman is proposing. If you read the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson set forth a bill of particulars against King George and the Parliament, and one of the central allegations of it was that they were denying the colonists the right to define criminal offenses for themselves. People over in England were dictating to people in our country what the criminal offenses should be, and that is like, with all due respect, the gentleman from Florida dictating to the people in Washington, D.C., how they should order their affairs when it comes to the criminal law.

Jefferson would have understood very well the situation that we are in, and our friends in Washington, 713,000 tax-paying, draftable U.S. citizens, have petitioned for statehood because they no longer want to be kicked around by other people's Representatives. They want to have an equal say in this body and an equal say in the U.S. Senate. They don't want other people's Representatives telling them that they can't pass the criminal offenses or the increased criminal sentences that they want for their crimes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the fact that the ranking member thinks so much about my future. What I think about these days are actually the people of Washington, D.C., and all the people who come to visit the Nation's Capital.

□ 1630

I also find it very interesting that, yes, the D.C. City Council finally did something on March 11 after the Oversight Committee started working on solutions because the District of Columbia City Council refused to actually address the crime issues in D.C. until very recently. That is important for people to understand.

Secondarily, we do have a constitutional obligation to the District of Columbia. The ranking member is well aware of that. Congress does have the authority to execute that authority if the council will not do it. They have refused until very recently, and so Congress is going to assert its authority to make sure that we try to secure the District to the best of our ability.

Last thing, to my friend on the other side of the aisle, I doubt anybody will confuse me with King George. I don't think we look alike. With that being said, it is very different when you are talking about a far-off capital across the ocean versus the Nation's Capital sitting in the Federal enclave, which is the District of Columbia. Congress has a responsibility to the District, and Congress should assert that authority with this language.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

Before I get into the nub, I will just respond to a couple things.

The baseline, the reason that you come down 16 percent and still have rabid crime is because you were so high the years before, and they were. Washington, D.C., was. We know it; you know it; everybody knows it.

I would also suggest that my friend from Florida is correct. The D.C. Council had not taken action that they needed to take. In fact, they had gone the other way and only recently were converted after Congress put pressure on them to make changes. By the way, that was bipartisan pressure, but somehow, we are told that is improper now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 7530, the DC CRIMES Act, which takes necessary steps to improve public safety in our Nation's Capital for its residents and for our constituents.

As violent crime skyrockets and D.C. police officer ranks continue to dwindle, the D.C. Council continues to push progressive policies that make everyone in D.C. unsafe. Their inaction has endangered residents of and visitors to our Nation's Capital, which is why in 2022, when the D.C. Council passed the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, I think we were all shocked.

The bill eliminated mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes except first-degree murder, eliminated life sentences, and reduced maximum penalties for violent crimes.

What whipsawed them back in just about an 18-month period? I suggest to you, respectfully, that it was because Congress was exercising its constitutional oversight authority over the District of Columbia, and that persuaded the council that they were in the eye and being watched by Congress. Their residents were also unhappy.

I am going to have to suggest, respectfully, that it wasn't the D.C. Council responding to crime across America and not just in D.C., which is an ironic argument to make, quite frankly, when you are claiming that Congress has no authority, when we have constitutional authority to oversee the actions of D.C. The reality is, the council was responding to oversight that is authorized by the Constitution.

Congress responded by blocking the reckless D.C. act from taking effect by advancing the bipartisan H.J. Res. 26 into law. The response from the D.C. Council was to then pass another bill, the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act, which targeted D.C. Metropolitan Police Department officers and their ability to combat rising crime.

Congress attempted to block this act with H.J. Res. 42, but President Biden vetoed the bipartisan disapproval resolution, ensuring D.C.'s antipolice reforms went into effect.

The D.C. Metropolitan Police Department has lost over 1,200 members since 2020 and staffing remains at the lowest level in 50 years, with officers often cit-

ing the D.C. Council's restrictive laws as their reasons for leaving. In a hearing last year, former D.C. Police Chief Contee noted that MPD needed an additional 800 officers to be fully staffed.

As a result of the council's continued soft-on-crime agenda, crime in D.C. has increased 30 percent in 2023 compared to the previous year.

Homicides were up 29 percent over 2022 and homicides doubled since 2012, which is why, when my colleague across the aisle begins saying they are down 16 percent in 2024, why do you think that is? It is because you had hit records in 2023 and now you are beginning to take this seriously because Congress is acting.

Violent crime increased by 37 percent from 2022 to 2023, with robberies rising 65 percent.

Motor vehicle thefts increased by 107 percent in 2023 compared to 2022.

Congressman DONALDS' bill ensures that Congress is fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities to oversee the district by lowering D.C.'s definition of youth to 18 and prohibiting D.C. from enacting new soft-on-crime sentencing changes in the future, which they no doubt will once Congress averts its eye from D.C.

However, if we enact Congressman DONALDS' bill, they will not be able to revert to their soft-on-crime ways, which has made D.C. unsafe for people, the millions of people who want to come and visit here and for the residents of this city.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona invites us to believe that the people of Washington, D.C., don't want to respond to spikes in crime in their own city. It is only in response to hearings called by Republican Members of Congress. I think that is an affront to our fellow citizens who obviously care deeply about what is going on in their own city, and I daresay a lot more than those of us who represent other jurisdictions, because we care principally about the places that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I will say before yielding to my friend from the District of Columbia that you don't have to look like a monarch or a tyrant to act like a monarch or a tyrant.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the distinguished, nonvoting delegate.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this radical, undemocratic, and paternalistic bill, as do the three top local, elected District of Columbia officials: Mayor Muriel Bowser, Council Chair Phil Mendelson, and D.C. Attorney General Brian Schwalb.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD their joint letter opposing this bill.

MAY 14, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We write today to express our opposition to H.R. 7530, the "DC CRIMES Act," which we understand the House will consider this week.

Since the start of the 118th Congress, the House has made a number of attempts to legislate on local District affairs. We always welcome opportunities to partner with Congress on issues. But the proposals included in H.R. 7530 would actually prevent the District government from taking steps to address dynamic crime trends.

In recent months, the Mayor and the Council have put into place several pieces of public safety legislation that included more than 100 new initiatives that have, among other things, expanded pretrial detention for violent offenders and enhanced penalties for certain gun crimes. Violent crime has decreased by 25 percent and property crime has decreased by 14 percent when compared to the same period last year. The Metropolitan Police Department (WPD) is making more arrests and the Office of the Attorney General is prosecuting cases at a rate almost double the prepandemic rates. And just this week, the Council is continuing its work on a Fiscal Year 2025 budget proposed by the Mayor that will make further strategic investments in MPD and crime prevention efforts.

If H.R. 7530 were law today, it would block us from taking some of these steps. By prohibiting the Council from enacting "any act, resolution, or rule to change any criminal liability sentence," the bill would prevent District policymakers from responding to emerging crime trends by enhancing criminal penalties, or even create new crimes. Swift and certain consequences are essential to deterring crime, and persistent congressional interference is at odds with that goal. Given recent experience, these delays could be extensive, preventing courts from imposing longer sentences while legislation languishes in Congress.

Due to the District's unique status, Congress already has a role to play, particularly in fully funding the federal agencies that are an integral part of our criminal justice system. As we know you are both aware, the Fiscal Year 2024 (FY24) appropriations bill funding the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia (PDS) contains a significant error that blocks the agency's access to a portion of its budget. The loss of these funds will force PDS to furlough staff for at least one day each week for the remainder of the fiscal year starting in June, routinely slowing down criminal proceedings. This delay only compounds the difficulties posed by the numerous court vacancies that Congress has failed to fill. PDS is a federal agency outside of our control. We ask Congress to set aside H.R. 7530, and work with us in partnership to ensure that PDS has the funds it needs, and our court system is able to function.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor of the District
of Columbia.

PHIL MENDELSON,
Chairman, Council of
the District of Co-
lumbia.

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for
the District of Co-
lumbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the substance of this bill, I want to discuss democracy and the lack of it in the District of Columbia.

D.C. residents, who have all the obligations of American citizenship, have no voting representation in Congress, and Congress has the ultimate say on local D.C. matters.

While my Republican colleagues are correct that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, their assertion that Congress has a constitutional duty to do so is simply wrong. Legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice. As the Supreme Court held in 1953, "there is no constitutional barrier to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power."

D.C.'s local legislature, the council, has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of their States. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how Members vote on local matters, they cannot vote them out of office. That is the antithesis of democracy.

The merits of this bill should be irrelevant, since there is never justification for Congress legislating on local D.C. matters. However, I will discuss the bill.

This bill would be the biggest rollback of D.C.'s self-government in a generation. This bill says the D.C. Council may not "enact any act, resolution, or rule to change any criminal liability sentence in effect on the date of the enactment of the DC CRIMES Act of 2024."

This provision, which does not define the term "criminal liability sentence," is as poorly drafted as it is offensive. It takes away D.C.'s authority to increase or decrease statutory criminal penalties. If D.C. wanted to increase penalties for violent crime, it could not do so. This bill could even be construed to prevent D.C. from establishing any new crimes at all.

This bill also reduces the maximum age of eligibility for D.C.'s Youth Rehabilitation Amendment Act of 1985. D.C. is not the only jurisdiction to have such a so-called young adult offender law. Alabama, Florida, Michigan, New York, South Carolina, and Vermont have such laws. The sponsor of this bill is from one of those six States.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation, yet D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress and pay full Federal

taxes. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 20 States.

If House Republicans cared about democratic principles or D.C. residents, they would bring to the floor my D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, which would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to reassert that the Constitution is clear on this matter, that Congress does have responsibilities and that the District of Columbia is under the jurisdiction of the United States Congress. That has been clear since the beginning of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, much has been made about the title of this bill, but I would remind my friends across the aisle that they had a bill called the Inflation Reduction Act and it spent over a trillion dollars and inflation has not been reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. DONALDS, for allowing me to speak.

Right now the city of Washington, D.C., considers a criminal a youth offender if they are under 25 years old, yet you can be a Member of Congress at 25 years old. It seems the Washington City Council believes something magical happens on someone's 25th birthday, Mr. Speaker.

They seem to believe that one day, dadgummit, you are a child who cannot be fully accountable for your actions and the next day you can serve in Congress. They are trying to be politically correct as always by not prosecuting criminals, and the city is suffering because of it.

Last year, the House Oversight Committee held a hearing with the District of Columbia's Mayor on the rising crime in our Nation's Capital. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, a carjacking was happening just up the street less than a mile from where we are standing today. We can appreciate the irony there, but it is not surprising. Carjackings and all other kinds of crimes are happening around Washington at any given moment.

Motor vehicle thefts increased by 107 percent last year alone. Violent crime increased by 37 percent, homicide increased by 29 percent, and robberies increased by 65 percent. It is also worth noting that in the United States, most homicides are committed by people 20 to 24 years old, Mr. Speaker.

However, the City Council of our Nation's Capital is still pushing policies every day that prevent criminals from being brought to justice.

The DC CRIMES Act forces Washington, D.C., to change its definition of juvenile back to kids under 18 years

old. It also stops judges from sentencing youth offenders below the mandatory minimum requirements and prevents Washington from changing the current minimum sentencing laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to have some basic common sense. I know that is lacking in Washington. When people tell me something that is made of common sense, I tell them they have no place in Washington, D.C., today. That is apparent right here. I support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell that family in the back that had that sweet little baby boy making those noises that he was not bothering us one bit.

□ 1645

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, could you please advise on how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 17¼ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Maryland has 16 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that the rules do not allow reference to persons in the gallery.

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

Let's see, no one on the other side has contradicted the plain, commonsense interpretation of this bill, which is that the District of Columbia Council will now be disabled from ever increasing a criminal penalty again, a criminal sentence again, and the District of Columbia Council will never be able to create a new criminal offense like the one they just created for running a retail theft ring, which has become a problem across the country in a lot of places. A lot of States have legislated on that. I know Maryland has legislated on that.

I am just wondering whether anyone on that side would yield for a question whether this is the deliberate intention of this legislation or it is just a mistake or whether they don't accept that plain, commonsense reading of the language of the bill because we are voting on something far more drastic and sweeping than what was represented by the sponsor's original statement.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield his time to me? I would be glad to take that question.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), momentarily, so that he can answer my question.

Are we interpreting it properly?

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. In part yes; in part no. That is to say, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia just read the section, it prohibits the Council from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences.

It does not prevent the D.C. Council from creating new crimes, like an organized retail crime act. It would prevent them from increasing sentences— Mr.

RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. As I understand the answer, the District of Columbia would not be able to increase the penalty for rape or the penalty for murder or the penalty for child sex abuse.

We might have a difference as to your second conclusion because, of course, it is increasing a criminal sentence to create a criminal sentence or offense where it didn't exist in the first place.

In any event, you are creating grave constitutional doubt about new criminal offenses that might be created in the District of Columbia with this legislation.

In any event, the first part is bad enough. The point is that, how is it tough on crime to say that the District of Columbia, as the gentleman just conceded, cannot increase criminal penalties if it chooses to in response to local circumstances?

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I would say in response to the gentleman from Maryland is that the D.C. Council has had ample opportunity to fix these issues in D.C., and they have refused until very recently, so it is just a matter of simple logic that unless Congress actually decides to use its authority, what would make us think that the D.C. Council will actually act in the interests of the citizens of the District?

The citizens of the District, I am quite sure, would love to have a safe city. The issue is that the Council has not acted toward actually having a safe city, and that is a significant problem for the Federal enclave because, I will state again, D.C. is a Federal enclave. Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, the Federal enclave is under the jurisdiction of the United States Congress, and we are acting under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS.)

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, D.C. is the modern-day Rome, a bastion of freedom for the world to see, and the front door of our great Nation. In my few short years serving the Fourth District of South Carolina in Congress, I have watched a once proud city succumb to violent crime, vagrancy, and fall into lawlessness.

There are many factors at play here, but the bottom line is this: I want to, in good faith, tell parents from my district that it is safe for the kids to come visit the Nation's Capital on their school trip. Right now, I can't do that. I actually do the exact opposite when people come to my office. I tell them that D.C. is not safe; they should take Ubers.

I have had time and time again where I have had people tell me that they have had serious issues. Just, I guess it was, a month ago, my commanding officer in the Air Force was staying in the Navy Yard. I told him not to walk to dinner. He did.

I called him at 6:30 in the morning, and I said: I bet you walked to dinner.

He said: You are right. I am about to go for a run.

I said: Well, you can't because there is an active shooter outside your building.

That was a month ago.

All this after years of vilifying and defunding the police, the District's violent crime and property theft have never been more blatant. D.C. criminals have never acted so brazenly and with more perceived impunity than I have witnessed in my years in Washington.

In fact, just today, at 1:40 this afternoon—and let me reiterate, this was 3 hours ago and in broad daylight—there was a stabbing just blocks away; a stabbing. Twelve hours before that there was an armed carjacking a few blocks north of there. The last 24 hours, we know how bad it is here, we were just on the GW campus where the mayor refused to enforce the rule of law. There were 250 people trespassing on the yard. The president of the university begged for the city to enforce the rule of law, and they didn't for 10 days. It required an Oversight hearing for her to actually do her job, to tell the MPD to arrest people.

I mean, all of this on top of the fact that an Uber driver that fled Afghanistan—and he was driving Uber Eats—a bunch of children under the age of 20 but over the age of 15 stole his car and killed him. They are going to get out of jail within a year or two, and they are going to have no criminal history.

Are we serious right now? So, yes, the D.C. Council has lost the faith of this institution.

Just this Congress, three Members have been held at gunpoint or assaulted, three Members of Congress in the last 18 months. This is out of control.

This is a small step in the right direction, but we have to respect the rule of law. We have to respect law enforcement, and we have to fund law enforcement. We should have 3,000 law enforcement officers in Washington, D.C. You are going to be down to 1,500 here shortly because of the way that the city council treats law enforcement. It is unacceptable.

These changes are just mere steps in the right direction. A 25-year-old is not a child. I can promise you this, in South Carolina, if a 16-year-old, a group of 16-year-olds killed somebody, they are going to be in prison for a while. They are going to be in prison for quite a while. The fact that they are not is exactly why we are having to do this right now.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate D.C.'s desire to have self-rule, but there are responsibilities that come along with that. It seems that our Na-

tion is a Nation in decline because of the lawlessness in Washington, D.C., and we have to get back on track. This is a step in the right direction.

I thank my friend from Florida for proposing this legislation. I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Before the gentleman leaves the Chamber, I thought I might note, I am going to give him some examples, some anecdotes and data since he appears to be legislating by vignette: In Summerville, South Carolina, last week there was a severe armed carjacking by three teenage suspects. In April, a man wanted for murder in Rock Hill was captured following another carjacking at a Huntersville QuikTrip.

I could give you a dozen of those. I don't think that the answer to any of that would be to disenfranchise the people of South Carolina or to have Congress usurp the State legislative authority or the local authority there.

My friend from Florida describes the District of Columbia as a Federal enclave, which of course it is not. A Federal enclave is a Federal property or land, like in Rockville, Maryland, which is my district, where we have the NIH. That is a Federal enclave.

This is the District constituting the seat of government set forth in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution.

Now, both of my friends over there say, well, we are going to take just a small step in the right direction.

How is it the right direction to deprive the people of the District of Columbia the power to have control over their own criminal sentencing, including the power to increase criminal sentences? If they had passed this legislation at the beginning of the year, they would have foreclosed the ability of the District of Columbia to increase criminal penalties across the board on a whole range of offenses and perhaps even to create new criminal offenses in the District.

The gentleman from South Carolina lectured the people of Washington, D.C., about criminal incidents taking place here, and of course there are criminal incidents taking place also in South Carolina in the exact same way.

However, how about something that took place even closer to home? How about the violent mob insurrection where a mob incited by the ex-President violently assaulted Capitol Police officers and Metropolitan Police Department officers who were forced to deploy to the Capitol, and nearly 150 of them ended up brutalized, wounded, and hospitalized after being hit over the head or in the chest or stabbed or speared by steel pipes, Confederate battle flags, Trump flags, and American flags, shamefully?

Yet, we have the ex-President and a number of people who are his sycophants over on that side of the aisle describing people who are in jail for that, a majority of them having pled guilty

for those offenses, the others convicted after due process of law, calling those people hostages.

A hostage is someone who has been illegally abducted by a terrorist or criminal entity, like Hamas, and held for a financial or political ransom. Yet, shamefully, there are people on that side of the aisle who call the prisoners who have been convicted after having been given every aspect of American due process and right to counsel, they are calling them hostages or political prisoners, like Alexei Navalny or Nelson Mandela. That is what they have come to.

They want to denounce a criminal event that happened six blocks away. What about the massive criminal event, the most massive criminal event in the history of the Nation's Capital that came right into this Chamber, forcing the Senators and Representatives to flee, and they won't say a word about it. Yet, they get up and they denounce lawlessness, and they won't even denounce lawlessness that comes right into the Congress and the Capitol of the United States.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of President.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I find that we are at this point in the debate where my friend from Maryland has lost the debate because now he is going back talking about other things that are not about the merits of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was about to comment that sooner or later you had to expect that the debate would be a rant about Donald Trump.

Let's get back to the subject matter at hand perhaps. To clarify, since the point has been raised repeatedly and continues to be repeated, here is what the D.C. Council would be prohibited from doing: enact any act, resolution, or rule to change any criminal liability sentence in effect on the date of the enactment of the DC CRIMES Act of 2024.

Nothing would keep the D.C. Council from creating new crimes. Nothing whatsoever. In fact, they would not be able to increase crime sentences, existing sentences for crimes, but they sure haven't shown any inclination whatsoever to do that.

The law professor from Maryland also made another elementary mistake in his recitation of the facts. As they said in law school, you have got to know the facts. He said that "crime is down 16 percent in the past year in D.C."

Look a little closer. Go to the website MPDC.DC.gov. That is the website for the Metropolitan Police Department. That reduction in crime that was cited, that is only for this year to

date. Go look at last year, 2023. In that situation: homicide, up 35 percent; robbery, up 67 percent; violent crime total, up 39 percent, et cetera. Across the board, all crime totaled up 26 percent, just last year.

I know it is out of memory now because we are into the first few months of the next year, but it hasn't gone away. The victims haven't gone away.

□ 1700

Here is what the gentleman from Maryland said, the law professor, that Thomas Jefferson would understand, but the Constitution that Thomas Jefferson signed said: "[The Congress shall have power . . .] to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all places purchased . . ."

That is pretty clear. It is not only the question of the interests of the roughly 700,000 D.C. citizens; it is the 19 million Americans who come to the seat of government every year and are threatened by the recklessness of the D.C. Council.

A moment's refresher about how we got to this place: The D.C. Council's radical rewrite of the entire criminal law that was reversed by H.J. Res. 26, which 31 Democrats voted to disapprove along with the majority, two Democrats from my home State, and eight Democrats couldn't bring themselves to vote. The rest of the extreme Democrats voted to stay out of the way, let them do what they wanted to.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Senate voted to disapprove, 81-14, and the President of the United States, Joe Biden, faithful Democrat, signed the legislation even though many extreme Democrats supported the D.C. Council's reckless action.

Then the other matter, H.J. Res. 42, to disapprove the "Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022," which Mayor Bowser also vetoed, and they overrode her veto.

They did all kinds of stuff to leave police officers at the tender mercies. They require juries to consider if officers consulted mental health, behavioral health, or social workers before using deadly force; imposed approval hurdles for the use of riot gear and nonlethal munitions necessary to protect officers; eliminated officers and union representatives from police complaint boards, restricted officers from using body cam footage in preparing reports, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

It is sheer recklessness, and it should be changed, and the way to change it is for Congress to take back the authority over criminal sentencing.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for pointing out that I accurately cited the statistics for all of the declines in crime and violent crime and homicides in the District of Columbia in 2024.

Alas, I do have to correct my friend in his history because there might be some students watching this. Thomas Jefferson never signed the Constitution. He was, of course, on a diplomatic mission when the Constitution was being signed in Philadelphia, but he did write the Declaration of Independence.

The other side says, bizarrely, that the District of Columbia Council and the Mayor should be denied the authority to increase criminal sentences forthwith because they have shown no inclination to increase criminal sentences.

Leaving aside the absolute illogic of the argument, it is also false because the District of Columbia in the secure D.C. act, passed just 2 months ago, increased criminal sentences across the board, which I am afraid my friends were completely oblivious to when they started this legislation. They weren't aware of it.

The people who claim to be speaking for the populous of Washington, D.C., didn't know that the Council had just acted to dramatically increase criminal penalties in the city. They denied them the right to further increase criminal penalties in the city because they say they haven't shown any inclination to do so which, of course, makes no sense and is also completely false.

All of this is pure political theater. It is bad political theater. Somebody decided a long time ago that it works for people who would never try to kick around their own State legislatures, their own county councils, or their own city councils to kick around the people of Washington, D.C.

My friends think that they have scored some kind of huge rhetorical coup, pointing out Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution, which indeed says that Congress shall exercise exclusive legislation over the District, constituting the seat of government from land that is ceded by various States.

Nobody on this side of the aisle, including the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, has denied that for a second.

What we have said is this is a massive assault on home rule, and it is also an embarrassing one because it cuts completely against all of the rhetoric that we are hearing from our colleagues across the aisle.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we have made some progress in this conversation because a plain reading of the distinguished gentleman from Florida's legislation indicates that what he is telling the District of Columbia is you may never increase criminal penalties again. The only time there can be an increase in criminal penalties in the District of Columbia is if Congress does it.

Unfortunately, this Congress has a hard time even keeping a Speaker in place without them trying to vacate the chair and topple the Speaker.

This Congress, as the whole country knows, has been absolute chaos and dysfunction and disorganization from the beginning.

I don't blame the people from Washington, D.C., who sent us these letters; the Mayor, the Council, and the Attorney General of D.C. saying thanks, but no thanks. We will take it from here.

The people in D.C. are perfectly able to decide what criminal offenses they need in the District of Columbia and how the sentences should be set and fixed.

They have courts in the District of Columbia, they have a legislature, the Council for the District of Columbia, which is elected from their eight wards and four at-large members and the chairman of the Council, and they have a Mayor. They have advisory neighborhood commissions.

I wonder if any of my colleagues over there are active in any of the wards or advisory neighborhood commissions where they live. I tend to doubt it.

The people of D.C., I understand from Congresswoman NORTON, are actually involved in the governance of their city and the management of their local affairs.

Yet, in this totally ham-handed and almost comically dysfunctional attempt to score points against D.C., they come up with legislation which says D.C. can never increase criminal penalties, again, when they are accusing D.C. of being too soft on crime, despite the fact that we are able to show that D.C. has tougher criminal sentences than many of the States represented by the Members who have been speaking about this over the last several days.

All of it feels a lot, to me, like a silly election-year stunt. I don't think anyone thinks that this is serious legislation, but I am glad at least that the other side has conceded that the bill means what it says.

They want to strip the District of Columbia of any power to increase criminal sentences in their city. I simply think that that is a terrible form of public policy and is a major inroad against home rule over the last several decades when, in fact, what we should be doing is giving the people of D.C. greater political self-government and giving them the rights to equal rep-

resentation which, of course, was the aforementioned Jefferson's ideal for the country.

If you go back and read the Northwest Ordinance, he thought that every part of the country would eventually attain a level of political equality by admission to Statehood through Article IV of the Constitution.

That is the spirit of the Constitution, not kicking around people, our fellow citizens, because we think we have more power than them, and we can score some political points off them.

Why don't we have a hearing about Statehood for the District of Columbia, and let's keep the engines of democracy, freedom, and political equality in the country moving.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. The District of Columbia thinks that you are to be tried as a minor if you are 23 years of age. Nowhere else in the United States does that exist—nowhere—except in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia Council has been derelict in its duty to actually provide for safety and security for the residents of the District of Columbia and the 19 million-plus Americans who come to the Federal enclave to visit the Nation's Capital.

For all the talk of political points that have been made in this debate, that has only come from my friend on the other side of the aisle.

He has talked about everything from President Trump to political talking points to political futures. He has talked very little about the reality that exists here in the Nation's Capital.

It doesn't take much for anybody to just see, whether it is on the nightly news, or frankly, just walking down the streets somewhere in the District of Columbia that something has gone very, very wrong.

Even here in this very building, Members and their staffs have experienced that. Our colleague from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG) was assaulted in an elevator in her own apartment building.

Our colleague on the other side of this building, Senator PAUL, his staffer was stabbed when walking home from work.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a Democrat Member of this Chamber, he was robbed and carjacked with guns pointed at his head blocks away from the United States Capitol.

You see, Mr. Speaker, these are not political talking points. This is real life. It is easy for the Members to come in and out of this building when we have security apparatus around us every single day but not take seriously what is happening in the streets of the Nation's Capital. This legislation takes that seriously.

I will end with this: It is not a time for election-year stunts. I agree with that 100 percent, which is why this leg-

islation is about having structural reforms to what has happened in the District of Columbia.

This is why the age for being tried as a minor is being decreased to under the age of 18, which mirrors what happens in every other part of the United States and should also occur here in the Nation's Capital.

This is a good piece of legislation. I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to vote for this. We have a responsibility to provide for a safe Washington, D.C., that the citizens can enjoy and that the people of the United States can enjoy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1227, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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 passage of the bill.

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 7530 will be followed by either 5-minute or 2-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 1210;

Passage of H.R. 7581;

Passage of H.R. 7343; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 4510;

H.R. 4310;

H.R. 4581;

H.R. 6960;

H.R. 1797;

H.R. 6572;

H.R. 6571; and

H.R. 3950.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 181, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Brecheen	Correa
Alford	Buchanan	Craig
Allen	Bucshon	Crane
Amodei	Burchett	Crawford
Armstrong	Burgess	Crenshaw
Arrington	Burlison	Cuellar
Babin	Calvert	Curtis
Bacon	Cammack	D'Esposito
Baird	Caraveo	Davidson
Balderson	Carey	Davis (NC)
Banks	Carl	De La Cruz
Bean (FL)	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Bentz	Carter (TX)	Donalds
Bergman	Chavez-DeRemer	Duarte
Bice	Cline	Duncan
Biggs	Cloud	Dunn (FL)
Billirakis	Clyde	Edwards
Bishop (NC)	Cole	Ellzey
Boebert	Collins	Emmer
Bost	Comer	Estes

Ezell Fallon Feenstra Ferguson Finstad Fischbach Fitzgerald Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Flood Foxy Franklin, Scott Fry Fulcher Gallego Garbarino Garcia, Mike Gimenez Golden (ME) Gonzales, Tony Gonzalez, Vicente Gooden (TX) Gosar Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Greene (GA) Grothman Guest Guthrie Hageman Harder (CA) Harshbarger Hern Higgins (LA) Hill Hinson Houchin Hudson Huizenga Hunt Issa Jackson (TX) James Johnson (LA) Johnson (SD) Jordan Joyce (PA) Kaptur Kean (NJ) Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Kiggans (VA)	Kiley Kim (CA) Kustoff LaHood LaLota LaMalfa Lamborn Langworthy Latta LaTurner Lawler Lee (FL) Lesko Letlow Loudermilk Lucas Luetkemeyer Luna Luttrell Mace Malliotakis Maloy Mann Mast McCaul McClintock McCormick McHenry Meuser Miller (IL) Miller (OH) Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks Mills Molinaro Moore (AL) Moran Moskowitz Murphy Nehls Newhouse Norcross Norman Nunn (IA) Obernolte Ogles Owens Palmer Panetta Peltola Pence Perez Perry Pfluger	Posey Reschenthaler Rodgers (WA) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rose Rosendale Rouzer Roy Rutherford Ryan Salazar Scalise Schrier Schweikert Scott, Austin Self Sessions Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smucker Sorensen Spartz Stauber Steel Stefanik Steil Steube Strong Tenney Thompson (PA) Tiffany Timmons Turner Valadao Van Drew Van Duyne Van Orden Wagner Walberg Waltz Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Williams (NY) Williams (TX) Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Yakym Zinke	Pallone Pappas Pascrell Pelosi Peters Phillips Pingree Pocan Porter Pressley Quigley Ramirez Raskin Ross Ruiz Ruppersberger Salinas Sanchez Sarbanes Scanlon Barr Boyle (PA) Ciscomani Cleaver Diaz-Balart Evans Gaetz Good (VA)	Schakowsky Schiff Schneider Scholtzen Scott (VA) Scott, David Sewell Sherman Slotkin Smith (WA) Soto Spanberger Stansbury Stanton Stevens Strickland Suozi Swallow Sykes Takano Griffith Grijalva Jackson Lee Joyce (OH) Kim (NJ) Magaziner Massie McClain	Thanedar Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Titus Tlaib Tokuda Tonko Torres (NY) Trahan Underwood Vargas Vasquez Veasey Velazquez Wasserman Schultz Waters Watson Coleman Wild Williams (GA) Meng Mooney Pettersen Sherrill Torres (CA) Trone Wexton Wilson (FL)	Garcia, Mike Gimenez Golden (ME) Gonzales, Tony Gonzalez, Vicente Gooden (TX) Gosar Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Greene (GA) Grothman Guest Guthrie Hageman Harder (CA) Harshbarger Hern Higgins (LA) James Johnson (LA) Johnson (SD) Jordan Joyce (OH) Joyce (PA) Kean (NJ) Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Kiggans (VA) Kiley Kim (CA) Kustoff LaHood LaLota LaMalfa Lamborn	Langworthy Latta LaTurner Lawler Lee (FL) Lee (NV) Lesko Letlow Loudermilk Lucas Luetkemeyer Luna Luttrell Mace Malliotakis Maloy Mann Massie Master McCaul McClintock McCormick Meuser Miller (IL) Miller (OH) Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks Mills Molinaro Moore (AL) Moran Murphy Nehls Newhouse Norman Nunn (IA) Obernolte Ogles Owens Palmer Peltola Pence Perez Perry Pfluger Posey Reschenthaler Rodgers (WA)	Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rose Rosendale Rouzer Roy Rutherford Salazar Scalise Scholten Schweikert Scott, Austin Self Sessions Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smucker Sorensen Stauber Steel Stefanik Steil Steube Strong Tenney Thompson (PA) Tiffany Timmons Turner Valadao Van Drew Van Duyne Van Orden Wagner Walberg Waltz Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Williams (NY) Williams (TX) Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Yakym Zinke
---	---	--	---	---	--	---	--	---

Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto

Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko

Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wild
Williams (GA)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—21

Barr
Boebert
Boyle (PA)
Cleaver
Costa
Diaz-Balart
Evans

Gaetz
Good (VA)
Grijalva
Jackson Lee
Kim (NJ)
Magaziner
McClain

McHenry
Mooney
Sherrill
Spartz
Trone
Wexton
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1750

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 7581) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, 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 passage of the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 356, nays 55, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—356

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amo
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barragan
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman

Beyer
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Brecheen
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal

Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole

Collins
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Elizy
Emmer
Eshoo
Español
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gallego
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudman
Huizenga
Hunt
Huntz
Issa
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
James
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)

Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi

Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Porter
Posey
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Lesko
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—55

Balint
Blumenauer
Bowman
Brown
Bush
Cárdenas
Carson
Casar
Clarke (NY)
Crockett
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Doggett
Escobar
Foushee
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)

Garcia, Robert
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
McClellan
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Nadler
Napolitano
Ocasio-Cortez
Pingree
Pocan

Pressley
Ramirez
Ruppersberger
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scott (VA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tokuda
Underwood
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—19

Barr
Boyle (PA)
Cleaver
Diaz-Balart
Evans
Gaetz
Good (VA)

Grijalva
Jackson Lee
Kim (NJ)
Magaziner
McClain
Mooney
Omar

Sherrill
Trone
Van Duyne
Wexton
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1756

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETAIN AND DEPORT ILLEGAL ALIENS WHO ASSAULT COPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, 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 passage of the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 148, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—265

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barragan
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen

Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Courtney

Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson

Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flood
Flood
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gallego
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kuster
Kustoff

NAYS—148

Adams
Aguilar
Amaro
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bowman
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn

LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
McCauley
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Peltola
Pence
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips

Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Scalise
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Suozi
Sykes
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Vasquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Mfume
Moore (WI)
Moulton
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pascarella
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez

Barr
Boyle (PA)
Cleaver
Diaz-Balart
Evans
Gaetz

Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Stansbury
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell

NOT VOTING—17

Good (VA)
Grijalva
Jackson Lee
Kim (NJ)
Magaziner
McClain

Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)

Mooney
Sherrill
Trone
Wexton
Wilson (FL)

Cline
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Ezell
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa

Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
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
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Matsui
McCauley
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar

Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1802

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4510) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, 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 gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 36, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—374

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amaro
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Banks
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz

Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Billakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burgess
Bush
Calvert
Cammack

Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

Wasserman	Wenstrup	Wilson (SC)
Schultz	Westerman	Wittman
Waters	Wild	Womack
Watson Coleman	Williams (GA)	Yakym
Weber (TX)	Williams (NY)	Zinke
Webster (FL)	Williams (TX)	

NAYS—36

Biggs	Gosar	Mills
Boebert	Green (TN)	Moore (AL)
Brecheen	Greene (GA)	Norman
Burchett	Hageman	Ogles
Burlison	Harris	Perry
Carson	Hunt	Posey
Cloud	Lofgren	Rosendale
Crane	Luna	Roy
Davidson	Massie	Schweikert
Donalds	Mast	Self
Fallon	McBath	Spartz
Foushee	McCormick	Steube

NOT VOTING—20

Barr	Good (VA)	McHenry
Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Mooney
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Sherrill
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Trone
Evans	Magaziner	Wexton
Gaetz	Malliotakis	Wilson (FL)
Garbarino	McClain	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1806

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.

YOUTH POISONING PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4310) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers, 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 33, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—376

Adams	Bentz	Bush
Aderholt	Bera	Calvert
Aguilar	Bergman	Caraveo
Alford	Beyer	Carbajal
Allen	Bice	Cárdenas
Allred	Bilirakis	Carey
Amodei	Bishop (GA)	Carl
Armstrong	Bishop (NC)	Carson
Arrington	Blumenauer	Carter (GA)
Auchincloss	Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)
Babin	Boebert	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Bonamici	Cartwright
Baird	Bost	Casar
Balderson	Bowman	Case
Balint	Brown	Casten
Banks	Brownley	Castor (FL)
Barragán	Buchanan	Castro (TX)
Bean (FL)	Bucshon	Chavez-DeRemer
Beatty	Budzinski	Cherfilus-
	Burgess	McCormick

Chu	Issa	Norcross	Veasey	Watson Coleman	Williams (TX)
Ciscomani	Ivey	Nunn (IA)	Velázquez	Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Clark (MA)	Jackson (IL)	Obernoite	Wagner	Webster (FL)	Wittman
Clarke (NY)	Jackson (NC)	Ocasio-Cortez	Walberg	Wenstrup	Womack
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Omar	Waltz	Westerman	Yakym
Clyburn	Jacobs	Owens	Wasserman	Wild	Zinke
Cohen	James	Pallone	Schultz	Williams (GA)	
Cole	Jayapal	Palmer	Waters	Williams (NY)	
Comer	Jeffries	Panetta			
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Pappas			
Correa	Johnson (SD)	Pascarella			
Costa	Jordan	Pelosi			
Courtney	Joyce (OH)	Peltola			
Craig	Joyce (PA)	Pence			
Crawford	Kamllager-Dove	Perez			
Crockett	Kaptur	Peters			
Crow	Kean (NJ)	Petterson			
Cuellar	Keating	Pfluger			
Curtis	Kelly (IL)	Phillips			
D'Esposito	Kelly (MS)	Pingree			
Davids (KS)	Kelly (PA)	Pocan			
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Porter			
Davis (NC)	Khanna	Pressley			
De La Cruz	Kiggans (VA)	Quigley			
Dean (PA)	Kildee	Ramirez			
DeGette	Kiley	Raskin			
DeLauro	Kilmer	Reschenthaler			
DelBene	Kim (CA)	Rodgers (WA)			
Deluzio	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (AL)			
Desaulnier	Kuster	Rogers (KY)			
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Rose			
Dingell	LaHood	Ross			
Doggett	LaLota	Rouzer			
Duarte	LaMalfa	Ruiz			
Duncan	Lamborn	Ruppersberger			
Dunn (FL)	Landsman	Rutherford			
Edwards	Langworthy	Ryan			
Ellzey	Larsen (WA)	Salazar			
Emmer	Larson (CT)	Salinas			
Escobar	Latta	Sánchez			
Eshoo	LaTurner	Sarbanes			
Espallat	Lawler	Scalise			
Ezell	Lee (CA)	Scanlon			
Fallon	Lee (FL)	Schakowsky			
Feenstra	Lee (NV)	Schiff			
Ferguson	Lee (PA)	Schneider			
Finstad	Leger Fernandez	Scholten			
Fischbach	Lesko	Schrier			
Fitzgerald	Letlow	Scott (VA)			
Fitzpatrick	Levin	Scott, Austin			
Fleischmann	Lieu	Scott, David			
Fletcher	Lofgren	Sessions			
Flood	Loudermilk	Sewell			
Foster	Lucas	Sherman			
Foushee	Luetkemeyer	Simpson			
Fox	Luna	Slotkin			
Frankel, Lois	Luttrell	Smith (MO)			
Franklin, Scott	Lynch	Smith (NE)			
Frost	Mace	Smith (NJ)			
Fry	Malliotakis	Smith (WA)			
Gallego	Maloy	Smucker			
Garamendi	Mann	Sorensen			
Garcia (IL)	Manning	Soto			
Garcia (TX)	Mast	Spanberger			
Garcia, Mike	Matsui	Spartz			
Garcia, Robert	McBath	Stansbury			
Gimenez	McCaul	Stanton			
Golden (ME)	McClellan	Staubert			
Goldman (NY)	McCollum	Steel			
Gomez	McGarvey	Stefanik			
Gonzales, Tony	McGovern	Steil			
Gonzalez,	McHenry	Stevens			
Vicente	Meeks	Strickland			
Gooden (TX)	Menendez	Strong			
Gottheimer	Meng	Suozzi			
Granger	Meuser	Swalwell			
Graves (LA)	Mfume	Sykes			
Graves (MO)	Miller (IL)	Takano			
Green (TN)	Miller (OH)	Tenney			
Green, Al (TX)	Miller (WV)	Thanedar			
Greene (GA)	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (CA)			
Griffith	Molinaro	Thompson (MS)			
Grothman	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)			
Guest	Moore (UT)	Timmons			
Guthrie	Moore (WI)	Titus			
Harder (CA)	Moran	Tlaib			
Hayes	Morelle	Tokuda			
Higgins (LA)	Moskowitz	Tonko			
Hill	Moulton	Torres (CA)			
Himes	Mrvan	Torres (NY)			
Hinson	Mullin	Trahan			
Horsford	Murphy	Turner			
Houchin	Nadler	Underwood			
Houlahan	Napolitano	Valadao			
Hoyer	Neal	Van Drew			
Hoyle (OR)	Neguse	Van Dwyne			
Hudson	Nehls	Van Orden			
Huffman	Newhouse	Vargas			
Huizenga	Nickel	Vasquez			

Biggs	Estes	Moore (AL)
Brecheen	Fulcher	Norman
Burchett	Gosar	Ogles
Burlison	Hageman	Perry
Cammack	Harris	Posey
Cloud	Harshbarger	Rosendale
Clyde	Hunt	Roy
Collins	Massie	Schweikert
Crane	McClintock	Self
Davidson	McCormick	Steube
Donalds	Mills	Tiffany

NAYS—33

Biggs	Estes	Moore (AL)
Brecheen	Fulcher	Norman
Burchett	Gosar	Ogles
Burlison	Hageman	Perry
Cammack	Harris	Posey
Cloud	Harshbarger	Rosendale
Clyde	Hunt	Roy
Collins	Massie	Schweikert
Crane	McClintock	Self
Davidson	McCormick	Steube
Donalds	Mills	Tiffany

NOT VOTING—20

Barr	Garbarino	McClain
Boyle (PA)	Good (VA)	Mooney
Cleaver	Grijalva	Sherrill
Crenshaw	Hern	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee	Wexton
Evans	Kim (NJ)	Wilson (FL)
Gaetz	Magaziner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1809

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH STILLBIRTH PREVENTION ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4581) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to support still-birth prevention and research, 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 gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—408

Adams	Beatty	Buchanan
Aderholt	Bentz	Bucshon
Aguilar	Bera	Budzinski
Alford	Bergman	Burchett
Allen	Beyer	Burgess
Allred	Bice	Burlison
Amodei	Biggs	Bush
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Calvert
Arrington	Bishop (GA)	Cammack
Auchincloss	Bishop (NC)	Caraveo
Babin	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Bacon	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Baird	Boebert	Carey
Balderson	Bonamici	Carl
Balint	Bost	Carson
Banks	Bowman	Carter (GA)
Barragán	Brecheen	Carter (LA)
Bean (FL)	Brown	Carter (TX)
	Brownley	Cartwright

Casas	Griffith	Meuser	Stansbury	Tiffany	Wagner	Bush	Gonzalez,	McCaul
Case	Grothman	Mfume	Stanton	Timmons	Walberg	Calvert	Vicente	McClellan
Casten	Guest	Miller (IL)	Staubert	Titus	Waltz	Cammack	Gooden (TX)	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Guthrie	Miller (OH)	Steel	Tlaib	Wasserman	Caraveo	Gottheimer	McCormick
Castro (TX)	Hageman	Miller (WV)	Strong	Tokuda	Schultz	Carbajal	Granger	McGarvey
Chavez-DeRemer	Harder (CA)	Miller-Meeks	Steil	Tonko	Waters	Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	McGovern
Cherfilus-	Harris	Mills	Steube	Torres (CA)	Watson Coleman	Carey	Graves (MO)	McHenry
McCormick	Harshbarger	Molinaro	Stevens	Torres (NY)	Weber (TX)	Carl	Green (TN)	Meeks
Chu	Hayes	Moolenaar	Strickland	Trahan	Webster (FL)	Carson	Green, Al (TX)	Menendez
Ciscomani	Hern	Moore (AL)	Strong	Turner	Wenstrup	Carter (GA)	Greene (GA)	Meng
Clark (MA)	Higgins (LA)	Moore (UT)	Suozzi	Underwood	Westerman	Carter (LA)	Griffith	Meuser
Clarke (NY)	Hill	Moore (WI)	Swalwell	Valadao	Wild	Carter (TX)	Grothman	Mfume
Cline	Himes	Moran	Sykes	Van Drew	Williams (GA)	Cartwright	Guest	Miller (IL)
Cloud	Hinson	Morelle	Takano	Van Dwyne	Williams (NY)	Casar	Guthrie	Miller (OH)
Clyburn	Horsford	Moskowitz	Tanney	Van Orden	Williams (TX)	Case	Hageman	Miller (WV)
Clyde	Houchin	Moulton	Thanedar	Vargas	Wilson (SC)	Casten	Harder (CA)	Miller-Meeks
Cohen	Houlahan	Mrvan	Thompson (CA)	Vasquez	Womack	Castor (FL)	Harshbarger	Mills
Cole	Hoyer	Mullin	Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Yakym	Castro (TX)	Hayes	Molinaro
Collins	Hoyle (OR)	Murphy	Thompson (PA)	Velázquez	Zinke	Chavez-DeRemer	Hern	Moolenaar
Comer	Hudson	Nadler				Cherfilus-	Higgins (LA)	Moore (AL)
Connolly	Huffman	Napolitano				McCormick	Hill	Moore (UT)
Correa	Huizenga	Neal	Foxx	Massie	McClintock	Chu	Himes	Moore (WI)
Costa	Hunt	Neguse				Ciscomani	Hinson	Moran
Courtney	Issa	Nehls				Clark (MA)	Horsford	Morelle
Craig	Ivey	Newhouse	Barr	Good (VA)	Mooney	Clarke (NY)	Houchin	Moskowitz
Crane	Jackson (IL)	Nickel	Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Sherrill	Cline	Houlahan	Moulton
Crawford	Jackson (NC)	Norcross	Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Trope	Cloud	Hoyer	Mrvan
Crenshaw	Jackson (TX)	Norman	Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Wexton	Clyburn	Hoyle (OR)	Mullin
Crockett	Jacobs	Nunn (IA)	Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)	Clyde	Hudson	Murphy
Crow	James	Obernolte	Gaetz	McClain	Wittman	Cohen	Huffman	Nadler
Cuellar	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez				Cole	Huizenga	Napolitano
Curtis	Jeffries	Ogles				Collins	Hunt	Neal
D'Esposito	Johnson (GA)	Omar				Comer	Issa	Neguse
Davidson	Johnson (SD)	Owens				Connolly	Ivey	Nehls
Davis (IL)	Jordan	Pallone				Correa	Jackson (IL)	Newhouse
Davis (NC)	Joyce (OH)	Palmer				Costa	Jackson (NC)	Nickel
De La Cruz	Joyce (PA)	Panetta				Courtney	Jackson (TX)	Norcross
Dean (PA)	Kamlager-Dove	Pappas				Craig	Jacobs	Nunn (IA)
DeGette	Kaptur	Pascarell				Crawford	James	Obernolte
DeLauro	Kean (NJ)	Pelosi				Crenshaw	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez
DelBene	Keating	Peltola				Crockett	Jeffries	Ogles
Deluzio	Kelly (IL)	Pence				Crow	Johnson (GA)	Omar
DeSaulnier	Kelly (MS)	Perez				Cuellar	Johnson (LA)	Owens
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Perry				Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
Dingell	Kennedy	Peters				D'Esposito	Jordan	Palmer
Doggett	Khanna	Pettersen				Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Panetta
Donalds	Kiggaans (VA)	Pfluger				Davis (IL)	Joyce (PA)	Pappas
Duarte	Kildee	Phillips				Davis (NC)	Kamlager-Dove	Pascarell
Duncan	Kiley	Pingree				De La Cruz	Kaptur	Pelosi
Dunn (FL)	Kilmer	Pocan				Dean (PA)	Kean (NJ)	Peltola
Edwards	Kim (CA)	Porter				DeGette	Keating	Pence
Ellzey	Krishnamoorthi	Posey				DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Perez
Emmer	Kuster	Pressley				DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Perry
Escobar	Kustoff	Quigley				Deluzio	Kelly (PA)	Peters
Eshoo	LaHood	Ramirez				DesSaulnier	Kennedy	Pettersen
Espallat	LaLota	Raskin				DesJarlais	Khanna	Pfluger
Estes	Reschenthaler	Rodgers (WA)				Dingell	Kiggaans (VA)	Phillips
Ezell	Rodgers (AL)	Rodgers (KY)				Doggett	Kildee	Pingree
Fallon	Rose	Rosendale				Duarte	Kiley	Pocan
Feenstra	Ross	Rouzer				Duncan	Kilmer	Porter
Ferguson	Roy	Ruiz				Dunn (FL)	Kim (CA)	Posey
Finstad	Ruiz	Ruppersberger				Edwards	Krishnamoorthi	Pressley
Fischbach	Rutherford	Ryan				Ellzey	Kuster	Quigley
Fitzgerald	Salazar	Salinas				Emmer	Kustoff	Ramirez
Fitzpatrick	Salinas	Sánchez				Escobar	LaHood	Raskin
Fleischmann	Sarbanes	Scalise				Eshoo	LaMalfa	Reschenthaler
Fletcher	Schier	Schweikert				Espallat	Lamborn	Rodgers (WA)
Flood	Schrier	Scott (VA)				Estes	Landsman	Rodgers (AL)
Foster	Schweikert	Scott (VA)				Ezell	Langworthy	Rogers (KY)
Foushee	Scott (VA)	Scott, Austin				Fallon	Larsen (WA)	Rose
Frankel, Lois	Scott, David	Self				Feenstra	Larsen (CT)	Ross
Franklin, Scott	Sessions	Sewell				Ferguson	Latta	Rouzer
Frost	Sewell	Sherman				Finstad	LaTurner	Ruiz
Fry	Sherman	Simpson				Fischbach	Lawler	Ruppersberger
Fulcher	Simpson	Slotkin				Fitzgerald	Lee (CA)	Rutherford
Gallo	Slotkin	Smith (MO)				Fitzpatrick	Lee (FL)	Ryan
Garamendi	Smith (MO)	Smith (NE)				Fleischmann	Lee (NV)	Salazar
Garbarino	Smith (NJ)	Smith (WA)				Fletcher	Lee (PA)	Salinas
Garcia (IL)	Smith (WA)	Sorenson				Flood	Leger Fernandez	Sánchez
Garcia (TX)	Soto	Spanberger				Foster	Lesko	Sarbanes
Garcia, Mike	Spartz					Foushee	Letlow	Scalise
Garcia, Robert						Frankel, Lois	Letlow	Scanlon
Gimenez						Franklin, Scott	Levin	Schakowsky
Golden (ME)						Frost	Lieu	Schiff
Goldman (NY)						Fry	Lofgren	Schneider
Gomez						Fulcher	Loudermilk	Scholten
Gonzales, Tony						Gallego	Lucas	Schrier
Gonzalez,						Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Vicente						Garbarino	Luna	Scott (VA)
Gooden (TX)						Garcia (IL)	Luttrell	Scott, Austin
Gosar						Garcia (TX)	Lynch	Scott, David
Gottheimer						Garcia, Mike	Mace	Sessions
Granger						Garcia, Robert	Malliotakis	Sewell
Graves (LA)						Gimenez	Maloy	Sherman
Graves (MO)						Golden (ME)	Mann	Simpson
Green (TN)						Goldman (NY)	Manning	Slotkin
Green, Al (TX)						Gomez	Mast	Smith (MO)
Greene (GA)						Gonzales, Tony	Matsui	Smith (NE)
							McBath	Smith (NJ)

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—18

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1814

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.

Stated for:

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 207.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6960) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program, 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 gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 13, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—399

Adams	Balderson	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Balint	Blunt Rochester
Agullar	Banks	Boebert
Alford	Barragán	Bonamici
Allen	Bean (FL)	Bost
Allred	Beatty	Bowman
Amo	Bentz	Brown
Amodei	Bera	Brownley
Armstrong	Bergman	Buchanan
Beyer	Bucshon	Bucshon
Bice	Budzinski	Burchett
Bilirakis	Burgess	Burlison
Bishop (GA)		
Bishop (NC)		

Smith (WA)	Thanedar	Veasey	Bost	Jimenez	Matsui	Stauber	Tlaib	Waltz
Smucker	Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Bowman	Golden (ME)	McBath	Steel	Tokuda	Wasserman
Sorensen	Thompson (MS)	Wagner	Brown	Goldman (NY)	McCaul	Stefanik	Tonko	Schultz
Soto	Thompson (PA)	Walberg	Brownley	Gomez	McClellan	Steil	Torres (CA)	Waters
Spanberger	Tiffany	Waltz	Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	McCollum	Stevens	Torres (NY)	Watson Coleman
Spartz	Timmons	Wasserman	Bucshon	Gonzalez,	McGarvey	Strickland	Trahan	Weber (TX)
Stansbury	Titus	Schultz	Budzinski	Vicente	McGovern	Strong	Turner	Webster (FL)
Stanton	Tlaib	Waters	Burgess	Gooden (TX)	McHenry	Suozi	Underwood	Wenstrup
Stauber	Tokuda	Watson Coleman	Bush	Gottheimer	Meeks	Swalwell	Valadao	Westerman
Steel	Tonko	Weber (TX)	Calvert	Granger	Menendez	Sykes	Van Drew	Wild
Stefanik	Torres (CA)	Webster (FL)	Cammack	Graves (LA)	Meng	Takano	Van Dune	Williams (GA)
Steil	Torres (NY)	Wenstrup	Caraveo	Graves (MO)	Meuser	Tenney	Van Orden	Williams (NY)
Steube	Trahan	Westerman	Carbajal	Green (TN)	Mfume	Thanedar	Vargas	Williams (TX)
Stevens	Turner	Wild	Cárdenas	Green, Al (TX)	Miller (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Vasquez	Wilson (SC)
Strickland	Underwood	Williams (GA)	Carey	Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)	Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Wittman
Strong	Valadao	Williams (NY)	Carl	Griffith	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (PA)	Velázquez	Womack
Suozi	Van Drew	Williams (TX)	Carson	Grothman	Moolenaar	Timmons	Wagner	Yakym
Swalwell	Van Dune	Wilson (SC)	Carter (GA)	Guest	Moore (UT)	Titus	Walberg	Zinke
Sykes	Van Orden	Wittman	Carter (LA)	Guthrie	Moore (WI)			
Takano	Vargas	Womack	Carter (TX)	Hageman	Moran			
Tenney	Vasquez	Yakym	Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Morelle			

NAYS—13

Biggs	Gosar	Rosendale
Brecheen	Harris	Roy
Crane	Massie	Self
Donalds	McClintock	
Foxx	Norman	

NOT VOTING—18

Barr	Good (VA)	Mooney
Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Sherrill
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Wexton
Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)
Gaetz	McClain	Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1817

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTING CONSUMER STANDARDS FOR LITHIUM-ION BATTERIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1797) to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard with respect to rechargeable lithium-ion batteries used in micro-mobility devices, 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 34, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—378

Adams	Auchincloss	Bentz
Aderholt	Babin	Bera
Aguilar	Bacon	Bergman
Alford	Baird	Beyer
Allen	Balderson	Bice
Allred	Ballint	Bilirakis
Amo	Banks	Bishop (GA)
Amodei	Barragán	Blumenauer
Armstrong	Bean (FL)	Blunt Rochester
Arrington	Beatty	Bonamici

Bost	Jimenez	Matsui	Stauber	Tlaib	Waltz
Bowman	Golden (ME)	McBath	Steel	Tokuda	Wasserman
Brown	Goldman (NY)	McCaul	Stefanik	Tonko	Schultz
Brownley	Gomez	McClellan	Steil	Torres (CA)	Waters
Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	McCollum	Stevens	Torres (NY)	Watson Coleman
Bucshon	Gonzalez,	McGarvey	Strickland	Trahan	Weber (TX)
Budzinski	Vicente	McGovern	Strong	Turner	Webster (FL)
Burgess	Gooden (TX)	McHenry	Suozi	Underwood	Wenstrup
Bush	Gottheimer	Meeks	Swalwell	Valadao	Westerman
Calvert	Granger	Menendez	Sykes	Van Drew	Wild
Cammack	Graves (LA)	Meng	Takano	Van Dune	Williams (GA)
Caraveo	Graves (MO)	Meuser	Tenney	Van Orden	Williams (NY)
Carbajal	Green (TN)	Mfume	Thanedar	Vargas	Williams (TX)
Cárdenas	Green, Al (TX)	Miller (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Vasquez	Wilson (SC)
Carey	Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)	Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Wittman
Carl	Griffith	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (PA)	Velázquez	Womack
Carson	Grothman	Moolenaar	Timmons	Wagner	Yakym
Carter (GA)	Guest	Moore (UT)	Titus	Walberg	Zinke
Carter (LA)	Guthrie	Moore (WI)			
Carter (TX)	Hageman	Moran			
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Morelle			
Casar	Harshbarger	Moskowitz			
Case	Hayes	Moulton			
Casten	Hern	Mrvan			
Castor (FL)	Higgins (LA)	Mullin			
Castro (TX)	Hill	Murphy			
Chavez-DeRemer	Himes	Nadler			
Cherfilus-	Hinson	Napolitano			
McCormick	Horsford	Neal			
Chu	Houchin	Neguse			
Ciscomani	Houlahan	Nehls			
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Newhouse			
Clarke (NY)	Hoyle (OR)	Nickel			
Clyburn	Hudson	Norcross			
Cohen	Huffman	Nunn (IA)			
Cole	Huizenga	Oberholte			
Comer	Issa	Ocasio-Cortez			
Connolly	Ivey	Omar			
Correa	Jackson (IL)	Owens			
Costa	Jackson (NC)	Pallone			
Courtney	Jackson (TX)	Palmer			
Craig	Jacobs	Panetta			
Crawford	James	Pappas			
Crenshaw	Jayapal	Pascarell			
Crockett	Jeffries	Pelosi			
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Peltola			
Cuellar	Johnson (LA)	Pence			
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Perez			
D'Esposito	Jordan	Peters			
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Pettersen			
Davis (IL)	Joyce (PA)	Pfluger			
Davis (NC)	Kamlager-Dove	Phillips			
De La Cruz	Kaptur	Pingree			
Dean (PA)	Kean (NJ)	Pocan			
DeGette	Keating	Porter			
DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Pressley			
DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Quigley			
Deluzio	Kelly (PA)	Ramirez			
DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Raskin			
DesJarlais	Khanna	Reschenthaler			
Dingell	Kiggans (VA)	Rodgers (WA)			
Doggett	Kildee	Rogers (AL)			
Donalds	Kiley	Rogers (KY)			
Duarte	Kilmer	Rose			
Duncan	Kim (CA)	Ross			
Dunn (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Rouzer			
Edwards	Kuster	Ruiz			
Ellzey	Kustoff	Ruppersberger			
Emmer	LaHood	Rutherford			
Escobar	LaLota	Ryan			
Eshoo	LaMalfa	Salazar			
Espallat	Lamborn	Salinas			
Estes	Landsman	Sánchez			
Ezell	Langworthy	Sarbanes			
Fallon	Larsen (WA)	Scalise			
Feenstra	Larson (CT)	Scanlon			
Ferguson	Latta	Schakowsky			
Finstad	LaTurner	Schiff			
Fischbach	Lawler	Schneider			
Fitzgerald	Lee (CA)	Scholten			
Fitzpatrick	Lee (FL)	Schrier			
Fleischmann	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)			
Fletcher	Lee (PA)	Scott, Austin			
Flood	Leger Fernandez	Scott, David			
Foster	Lesko	Sessions			
Foushee	Letlow	Sewell			
Foxx	Levin	Sherman			
Frankel, Lois	Lieu	Simpson			
Franklin, Scott	Loftgren	Slotkin			
Frost	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)			
Fry	Lucas	Smith (NE)			
Gallego	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)			
Garamendi	Luttrell	Smith (WA)			
Garbarino	Lynch	Smucker			
Garcia (IL)	Mace	Sorensen			
Garcia (TX)	Malliotakis	Soto			
Garcia, Mike	Maloy	Spanberger			
Garcia, Robert	Mann	Stansbury			
	Manning	Stanton			

NAYS—34

Biggs	Gosar	Ogles
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perry
Boebert	Hunt	Posey
Brecheen	Luna	Rosendale
Burchett	Massie	Roy
Burlison	Mast	Schweikert
Cline	McClintock	Self
Cloud	McCormick	Spartz
Clyde	Miller (IL)	Steube
Collins	Mills	Tiffany
Crane	Moore (AL)	
Fulcher	Norman	

NOT VOTING—18

Barr	Good (VA)	Molinaro
Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Mooney
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Sherrill
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Trone
Evans	Magaziner	Wexton
Gaetz	McClain	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1820

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.

DEPLOYING AMERICAN BLOCKCHAINS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6572) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take actions necessary and appropriate to promote the competitiveness of the United States related to the deployment, use, application, and competitiveness of blockchain technology or other distributed ledger technology, 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 334, nays 79, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—334

Adams	Allen	Armstrong
Aderholt	Allred	Arrington
Aguilar	Amo	Auchincloss
Alford	Amodei	Babin

Bacon	Golden (ME)	Miller (IL)	Torres (CA)	Veasey	Westerman	[Roll No. 211] YEAS—390	
Baird	Goldman (NY)	Miller (OH)	Torres (NY)	Wagner	Wild		
Balderson	Gomez	Miller (WV)	Trahan	Walberg	Williams (NY)		
Balint	Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks	Turner	Waltz	Williams (TX)	Adams	Khanna
Banks	Gooden (TX)	Molinaro	Valadao	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)	Aderholt	Kiggans (VA)
Barragán	Gottheimer	Moolenaar	Van Drew	Schultz	Wittman	Aguilar	Kildee
Bean (FL)	Granger	Moore (UT)	Van Dwyne	Weber (TX)	Womack	Alford	Kiley
Bentz	Graves (LA)	Moran	Van Orden	Webster (FL)	Yakym	Allen	Kilmer
Bera	Graves (MO)	Morelle	Vasquez	Wenstrup	Zinke	Allred	Kim (CA)
Bergman	Green (TN)	Moskowitz				Amo	Krishnamoorthi
Beyer	Griffith	Moulton				Amodei	Kuster
Bice	Grothman	Mrvan	Beatty	Foster	Napolitano	Armstrong	Kustoff
Bilirakis	Guest	Mullin	Biggs	Frost	Norman	Arrington	LaHood
Bishop (GA)	Guthrie	Murphy	Bishop (NC)	Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Auchincloss	LaLota
Blumenauer	Harder (CA)	Nadler	Boebert	Garcia (TX)	Ogles	Babin	LaMalfa
Blunt Rochester	Harshbarger	Neal	Bonamici	Gonzalez,	Omar	Bacon	Lamborn
Bost	Hayes	Neguse	Bowman	Vicente		Baird	Landsman
Brown	Hern	Nehls	Brecheen	Gosar	Perry	Balderson	Langworthy
Brownley	Hill	Newhouse	Burchett	Green, Al (TX)	Petterson	Balint	Larsen (WA)
Buchanan	Himes	Nickel	Burlison	Greene (GA)	Pocan	Ferguson	Larson (CT)
Bucshon	Hinson	Norcross	Bush	Hageman	Posey	Bean (FL)	Latta
Budzinski	Horsford	Nunn (IA)	Cammack	Harris	Pressley	Beatty	LaTurner
Burgess	Houchin	Oberholte	Casar	Higgins (LA)	Ramirez	Bentz	Lawler
Calvert	Houlahan	Owens	Casten	Hunt	Rosendale	Bera	Lee (CA)
Caraveo	Hoyer	Pallone	Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Roy	Bergman	Lee (FL)
Carbajal	Hoyle (OR)	Palmer	Chu	Jeffries	Self	Beyer	Lee (NV)
Cárdenas	Hudson	Panetta	Cline	Jordan	Sherman	Bice	Lee (PA)
Carey	Huffman	Pappas	Cloud	Larson (CT)	Spartz	Bilirakis	Leger Fernandez
Carl	Huizenga	Pascrell	Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Steube	Bishop (GA)	Foushee
Carson	Issa	Pelosi	Clyde	Lee (PA)	Thompson (MS)	Bishop (NC)	Foxx
Carter (GA)	Ivey	Peltola	Correa	Leger Fernandez	Tiffany	Blumenauer	Frankel, Lois
Carter (LA)	Jackson (IL)	Pence	Crane	Luna	Tlaib	Blunt Rochester	Franklin, Scott
Carter (TX)	Jackson (NC)	Perez	Davidson (KS)	Massie	Underwood	Bonamici	Frost
Cartwright	Jackson (TX)	Peters	Davidson	McClintock	Vargas	Bost	Fry
Case	Jacobs	Pfluger	Dean (PA)	McGovern	Velázquez	Bowman	Fulcher
Castor (FL)	James	Phillips	Doggett	Mills	Waters	Brecheen	Gallego
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Donalds	Moore (AL)	Watson Coleman	Brown	Garamendi
Cherfilus-	Johnson (SD)	Porter	Escobar	Moore (WI)	Williams (GA)	Brownley	Garbarino
McCormick	Johnson (LA)	Quigley				Buchanan	Garcia (IL)
Ciscomani	Joyce (OH)	Raskin				Bucshon	Garcia (TX)
Clark (MA)	Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler	Barr	Good (VA)	Mooney	Budzinski	Garcia, Mike
Clarke (NY)	Kamlager-Dove	Rodgers (WA)	Boyle (PA)	Grijalva	Sherrill	Burchett	Garcia, Robert
Cohen	Kaptur	Rogers (AL)	Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Trone	Burgess	Jimenez
Cole	Kean (NJ)	Rogers (KY)	Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Wexton	Bush	Golden (ME)
Collins	Keating	Rose	Evans	Magaziner	Wilson (FL)	Calvert	Goldman (NY)
Comer	Kelly (IL)	Ross	Gaetz	McClain		Cammack	Gomez
Connolly	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer				Caraveo	Gonzales, Tony
Costa	Kelly (PA)	Ruiz				Carbajal	Gonzalez,
Courtney	Kennedy	Ruppersberger				Cárdenas	Vicente
Craig	Khanna	Rutherford				Carey	Gooden (TX)
Crawford	Kiggans (VA)	Ryan				Carl	Gottheimer
Crenshaw	Kildee	Salazar				Carson	Granger
Crockett	Kiley	Salinas				Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)
Crow	Kilmer	Sánchez				Carter (LA)	Graves (MO)
Cuellar	Kim (CA)	Sarbanes				Carter (TX)	Green (TN)
Curtis	Krishnamoorthi	Scalise				Cartwright	Griffith
D'Esposito	Kuster	Scanlon				Casar	Grothman
Davis (IL)	Kustoff	Schakowsky				Case	Guest
Davis (NC)	LaHood	Schiff				Casten	Guthrie
De La Cruz	LaLota	Schneider				Castor (FL)	Hageman
DeGette	LaMalfa	Scholten				Castro (TX)	Harder (CA)
DeLauro	Lamborn	Schrier				Chavez-DeRemer	Harshbarger
DelBene	Landsman	Schweikert				Cherfilus-	Hayes
Deluzio	Langworthy	Scott (VA)				McCormick	Hern
DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)	Scott, Austin				Chu	Higgins (LA)
DesJarlais	Latta	Scott, David				Ciscomani	Hill
Dingell	LaTurner	Sessions				Clark (MA)	Himes
Duarte	Lawler	Sewell				Clarke (NY)	Hinson
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Simpson				Cloud	Horsford
Dunn (FL)	Lee (NV)	Slotkin				Clyburn	Houchin
Edwards	Lesko	Smith (MO)				Clyde	Houlahan
Ellzey	Letlow	Smith (NE)				Cohen	Hoyer
Emmer	Lieu	Smith (NJ)				Cole	Hoyle (OR)
Eshoo	Lofgren	Smith (WA)				Collins	Hudson
Españat	Loudermilk	Smucker				Comer	Huffman
Estes	Lucas	Sorensen				Connolly	Huizenga
Ezell	Lucas	Soto				Correa	Hunt
Fallon	Luetkemeyer	Spanberger				Costa	Issa
Feenstra	Luttrell	Stansbury				Courtney	Ivey
Ferguson	Lynch	Stanton				Craig	Jackson (IL)
Finstad	Mace	Stauber				Crawford	Jackson (NC)
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Steel				Crenshaw	Jackson (TX)
Fitzgerald	Maloy	Stefanik				Crockett	Jacobs
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Steil				Crow	James
Fleischmann	Manning	Stevens				Cuellar	Jayapal
Fletcher	Mast	Strickland				Curtis	Jeffries
Flood	Matsui	Strong				D'Esposito	Johnson (GA)
Foushee	McBath	Suozi				Davis (IL)	Johnson (LA)
Foxx	McCaul	Swalwell				Davidson	Johnson (SD)
Frankel, Lois	McClellan	Sykes				Davis (NC)	Joyce (OH)
Franklin, Scott	McCollum	Takano				Davis (TX)	Joyce (PA)
Fry	McCormick	Tenney				De La Cruz	Kamlager-Dove
Fulcher	McGarvey	Thanedar				Dean (PA)	Kaptur
Gallego	McHenry	Thompson (CA)				DeGette	Kean (NJ)
Garamendi	Meeks	Thompson (PA)				DeLauro	Keating
Garbarino	Menendez	Timmons				DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Garcia, Mike	Meng	Titus				Deluzio	Kelly (MS)
Garcia, Robert	Meuser	Tokuda				DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)
Jimenez	Mfume	Tonko				DesJarlais	Kennedy

NAYS—79

NOT VOTING—17

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1824

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.

PROMOTING RESILIENT SUPPLY CHAINS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6571) to establish a critical supply chain resiliency and crisis response program in the Department of Commerce, and to secure American leadership in deploying emerging technologies, 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 19, not voting 21, as follows:

Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rodgers (AL)
Rodgers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell

Sherman
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib

Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—19

Biggs
Boebert
Burlison
Cline
Crane
Gosar
Green, Al (TX)

Greene (GA)
Harris
Jordan
Massie
McClintock
Norman
Ogles

Perry
Rosendale
Roy
Schweikert
Self

NOT VOTING—21

Banks
Barr
Boyle (PA)
Cleaver
Diaz-Balart
Evans
Gaetz

Good (VA)
Grijalva
Jackson Lee
Kim (NJ)
Magaziner
McClain
McHenry

Mooney
Nunn (IA)
Ruiz
Sherrill
Trone
Wexton
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1827

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.

Stated for:

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote No. 211 on H.R. 6571, I mistakenly recorded my vote as NAY when I should have voted YEA.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the following floor vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 211, H.R. 6571.

TRANSPARENCY IN CHARGES FOR KEY EVENTS TICKETING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3950) to require sellers of event tickets to disclose comprehensive information to consumers about ticket prices and related fees, 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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 24, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—388

Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amo
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Banks
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burgess
Bush
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson

Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Eshoo
Españillat
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foushee
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga

Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landman
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
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)

Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rodgers (AL)
Rodgers (KY)
Rose

Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes

NAYS—24

Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brecheen
Burchett
Burlison
Clyde
Crane

Donalds
Gosar
Greene (GA)
Hunt
Luna
Massie
McClintock
McCormick

Mills
Norman
Ogles
Perry
Rosendale
Roy
Self
Steube

NOT VOTING—18

Barr
Boyle (PA)
Cleaver
Diaz-Balart
Evans
Gaetz

Good (VA)
Grijalva
Jackson Lee
Kim (NJ)
Magaziner
McClain

McHenry
Mooney
Sherrill
Trone
Wexton
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN ORDEN) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1830

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.

HONORING OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN BLUE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, tens of thousands of law enforcement officers from across the country will arrive in Washington for National Police Week.

Created in 1962 through a joint resolution by Congress, National Police Week pays special recognition to those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of others.

National Police Week is sponsored by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund and supported by a variety of organizations to honor the law enforcement community. This week honors the men and women in blue who gave everything to protect their country and their communities.

At a time when our Nation is facing a rise in crime and attacks on police officers, we need to support our law enforcement more than ever. This is why I am proud to cosponsor legislation that memorializes law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty and also proudly cosponsored H.R. 354, the LEOSA Reform Act, to expand carrying privileges for off-duty and retired law enforcement officers.

Our officers put on their uniforms each day knowing that they can be in harm's way at any moment. On behalf of a grateful Nation, I thank all of our officers who serve.

SUPPORTING ISRAEL'S SECURITY

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

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my unwavering support for Israel. She continues to be under threats to her existence: Hamas' brutal attack, Hezbollah's rockets, and Iran's missiles.

I thank President Biden and a bipartisan Congress for the support for Israel's security because Israel's security is our security.

Now, we must stand by our commitment to our ally and send the vital assistance that we have promised without delay.

The U.S.-Israel relationship is iron-clad, and it is critical to defeating Hamas, bringing the hostages home, and delivering peace to a very hostile region.

CELEBRATING ACHIEVEMENTS OF GIANNA BROWN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements of New Hampstead High's Gianna Brown, who recently was named the winner of the 32nd annual Hollis Stacy Award.

The Hollis Stacy Award is presented annually to the area's most versatile female athlete in Savannah, Georgia. Gianna, who is MVP on all four of her high school sports teams, embodies this award.

In addition to being an All-Greater Savannah first team selection in flag

football and basketball, she was also an All-Region first team pick as middle blocker in volleyball and as a goalkeeper in soccer.

Gianna is truly an all-star. Not only is she great at flag football, but she is also a star on the basketball court. In just her second year playing basketball, she was a quick study as she averaged 20.6 points per game and 11 rebounds per game.

Gianna's record speaks for itself. She is a multisport star, and the First District could not be prouder of her.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Gianna. I know we will continue to see her success on the field for years to come.

UNDERSTANDING TURBULENCE INCIDENTS

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Michigan's 11th District to celebrate the overwhelming bipartisan passage of the FAA reauthorization, which included my bill, the Severe Turbulence Research and Development Act.

Turbulence is a leading cause of injuries to flight crews and the flying public, yet we lack a fundamental understanding of why turbulence incidents are increasing in frequency and severity. We also lack the ability to accurately predict where turbulence incidents will occur to adjust flight routes. This is unacceptable.

The FAA does not have the research, resources, and datasets needed to keep people safe. That is why my bill will enhance the monitoring and understanding of severe turbulence and inform the development of measures to mitigate safety impacts on crew and the flying public that may result from severe turbulence.

Today is a great day for flight crews, pilots, and airports across America. Again, I celebrate the passage of this legislation and look forward to seeing it signed into law.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, on this National Police Week, I rise to honor the brave men and women of law enforcement.

This week could not have come at a more important time. Many members of law enforcement, both rookies and 30-year veterans, are disheartened far too often by the treatment police officers have experienced in recent years.

Their dedication is to protect and serve their communities, yet far too often, they are disrespected, defunded, demoralized, and even demonized—not by many, but enough, and too often by elected community leaders. This must stop.

Many criminal prosecutors also need to do their jobs. There are too many violent criminals who break firearm possession laws and are released. We must enforce the firearm laws that exist. This will reduce so-called gun violence.

Too many prosecutors are failing to prosecute violent criminals. This endangers citizens, diminishes public safety, and puts police officers at high risk.

As the son of a former police officer, I always back the blue. There is always room for improvement, but we all should always respect the men and women who do, in fact, risk their lives to protect and serve and too often give their lives for their job, community, and for the people they work for.

DESIGNATING NATIONAL SENIOR FRAUD AWARENESS DAY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advocate for the designation of May 15 as National Senior Fraud Awareness Day.

This bipartisan resolution we are introducing aims to draw attention to the alarming increase in fraudulent schemes targeting seniors across the United States.

In 2023 alone, individuals over 60 reported losses totaling nearly \$2 billion from various forms of fraud spanning all 50 States.

Senior fraud is not merely a regional concern. It is a pervasive national challenge that demands our collective attention. We must collaborate to implement effective policies and measures aimed at preventing these scams to protect our seniors from financial exploitation.

One of the major obstacles to combating senior fraud is the significant underreporting of incidents. Many victims hesitate to come forward due to feelings of shame, stigma, and a lack of awareness regarding where to report such crimes.

By designating May 15 as National Senior Fraud Awareness Day, we can raise public awareness, empower seniors with knowledge, and provide them with the resources they need to report fraud effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in our bipartisan effort to end fraud against seniors.

□ 1845

CELEBRATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, National Police Week is our opportunity

to slow down a little bit and recognize those officers that put it on the line for us each day, each week, each month, and each year.

They face a lot of obstacles that they encounter in their efforts just to keep us safe and keep criminals off the street and hopefully prosecuted.

When I first entered into the political realm as a candidate, I met a deputy one time who was so frustrated with the state of the criminal justice system at that point.

He told me that he was aggravated that those that he arrested would beat him home from being released before he could even get the paperwork done.

As we see the situation with prosecutors not prosecuting and with a revolving door in our jail system, we really need to dig deep and not only thank our officers but also pass legislation that supports them in their efforts to do what we ask them to keep the streets safe and not have ridiculous defund the police efforts happening in some of these blue cities. Indeed, they are feeling the regret of defunding them at this time.

IMMIGRATION ISSUES

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, to hear Republicans tell it, the only problem with our immigration system is the border. That is a lie. Our process for legal immigration is badly broken.

In 2023, 35 million people applied for green cards; some for economic opportunities, some to bring their families together, and some to flee violence.

Of the millions in the green card lottery, what percentage got them? Go ahead. Take a guess. Twenty percent? Five percent? One percent? Nope. Mr. Speaker, it was 0.2 percent. That is wholly unacceptable.

This deeply dysfunctional system for lawfully entering the United States worsens unlawful immigration. The two are connected.

Congress can fix immigration, not just point the finger at those seeking a better life. Instead of blaming everyone else for our broken immigration system, Republicans should own up to the fact that Congress, under their leadership, is what is broken.

HONORING LOUISIANA OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

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

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H. Res. 1226, memorializing law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty, that I am proudly co-leading with Representatives MICHAEL GUEST, CHRIS PAPPAS, and ABIGAIL SPANBERGER.

Today, I would like to take a moment to honor the courageous heroes

from my home State of Louisiana who have been added to the Fallen Law Enforcement Officers Memorial:

Officer Carl Douglas Kimball; Deputy Sheriff Marilyn Anjanette Mayo; Officer Trevor Aron Abney; Corporal Scotty Wayne Canezaro; Sergeant Nicholas Neal Pepper; Sergeant Charles Fitzgerald Dotson; Lieutenant Barry Paul Giglio; Corporal Robert William McKinney; Deputy First Class Kyle Michael Melancon; Sergeant David Jacob Poirrier; Corporal Shawn Kevin Kelly; and Lieutenant Michael Stephen Godawa.

I ask everyone to join me in praying for these officers and their families who put their lives on the line each day for every American.

May we continue to teach future generations the critical mission that law enforcement personnel undertake in service to our communities.

HONORING DON LEE

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

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a giant in the New York City AAPI community, Don Lee.

Don was driven by a passion to support his AAPI neighbors and make government work for everyone. He connected underserved AAPI businesses with resources and government contracts traditionally kept out of reach.

After 9/11 devastated the Manhattan Chinatown community, Don served as a liaison between neighborhood businesses and FEMA.

He protested for transit access after the Grand Street Subway closure in 1995, helped expand licenses for Chinatown street vendors, and tirelessly fought against anti-Asian hate in the wake of COVID.

Throughout all of this, Don was the board chair of Homecrest Community Services for two decades, an anchor for disadvantaged communities throughout South Brooklyn. Homecrest created three new centers under his leadership.

Last weekend, Don passed away, somewhat suddenly, and we all mourn his loss.

On a personal note, Don was an early supporter of mine who took the time to invest in me, mentor me, guide me, and helped build my relationship with the large AAPI community in my district.

My heart breaks for his wife, Lai, and daughter, Victoria, in the wake of his passing, but I know that they, along with New York's AAPI community and our entire city, are inspired by the life Don led and the legacy that he leaves.

UNIVERSITY PROTESTS

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

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, at university after university, we have been seeing acts of moral cowardice and failures of leadership as university presidents cave to the demands of lawless encampments and anti-Semitic demands like cutting ties with Hillel or divesting from Israel or ending study abroad in Israel.

Today brought the most egregious example yet where Sonoma State in California, not far from my district, not only agreed to the full set of BDS demands of the encampment but also agreed to convert the encampment into a permanent governing authority to assure that that agreement is enforced in a sufficiently anti-Semitic manner. I am not kidding. You almost can't believe this is real.

It says the council here will be composed of members from the encampment, faculty, staff, administrators, Palestinian alumni, and other interested students as determined by Students for Justice in Palestine.

Any university leader who is entering into these kind of agreements is elevating groups who are willing to engage in lawless action and to pursue their despicable agenda by force while silencing other groups and silencing any debate to the contrary.

Any president who would agree to this is not fit to lead a university in our State or our country.

HONORING SERGEANT BILL HOOSER

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

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Police Week, and I am grateful for the opportunity to honor the brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day to ensure our safety.

Law enforcement officers face unique challenges that most of us cannot even imagine. They have accepted the call to serve and protect others, risking immense cost to themselves and their families.

Just the other week, I joined the Utah House delegation in a moment of silence here on the House floor for Sergeant Bill Hooser who was tragically killed at a traffic stop in Santaquin, Utah.

Reports say he was helping a woman who was being driven against her will. As Sergeant Hooser was assisting her, the assailant drove his vehicle toward Sergeant Hooser, ending his life. Sergeant Hooser's final moments were spent serving his community and helping a woman in harm.

This is a senseless tragedy and one that will take much time to process. I join his family, friends, and the community in paying tribute to this great public servant.

This year alone, 56 law enforcement officers throughout our Nation have died in the line of duty. They are our heroes.

As crime surges across the Nation, we simply cannot allow the growing anti-police sentiment to take any root. We must show unwavering support for those who stand ready to protect us and our families.

My colleagues and I support our law enforcement. They risk their lives so we can live in safety, and we will always be thankful.

ENHANCING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STAUBER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening with my colleagues to have a discussion about the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the Nation's number one antipoverty program for children. More veterans rely on Social Security disability than they do on the VA.

Mr. Speaker, we want to make sure that we are addressing this to our colleagues. Since you are in the chair from Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that you have more than 189,000 Social Security recipients in your district; more than 147,000 retirees; more than 20,000 disabled; 8,000 widows; 9,000 children.

Here is the key, Mr. Speaker, \$335 million a month comes into your district for those Social Security recipients. Where do they spend it? Right back in their district.

Yet, it has been more than 53 years since Congress has enhanced Social Security. Richard Nixon was President of the United States the last time Social Security was enhanced.

Democrats are bound and determined to make sure that we get something simple like a vote here in Congress to help out all of those people in your district, Mr. Speaker, as well as highlight why this is so important.

Seventy million Americans rely on Social Security. Ten thousand baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security. Forty thousand Americans rely on Social Security in and of itself as their primary tenet for retirement.

It is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and for children. That is why our colleagues have taken to the floor today, so that the American people understand that what is between them and enhancement to this program is a vote. It is a vote on Social Security 2100, that will extend the solvency of Social Security, but, as importantly, expand benefits, including making sure that the more than 23 million people that pay taxes on Social Security no longer have to do that.

What could be a better bipartisan plan than helping out every single individual in everyone's district and also providing for 23 million Americans, not

the wealthiest Americans but the everyday citizens who work weeklong to provide for their families and pay into a system and haven't received an enhancement in 53 years.

That is why JOE NEGUSE is here as part of leadership that has strongly endorsed this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

□ 1900

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, our former Caucus chair, for his clarion call that he has issued year after year, month after month, and day after day to protect and strengthen Social Security.

It couldn't be more important, and we couldn't be more grateful for his leadership and the leadership of so many of my colleagues who have joined us tonight on the House floor to talk to the American people about the ways in which House Democrats are protecting critical programs like Social Security and Medicare and the myriad ways in which, unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing the exact opposite.

I will give you but one example, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the latter. I know you are familiar with the Republican Study Committee, the largest caucus within the Republican Conference. I don't know if the American people are familiar with it.

Eighty percent of the Republican Conference consider themselves members of this committee. A hundred percent of House Republican leadership count themselves among the members of this committee. The former chairman of the Republican Study Committee is now the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Why do I bring up the Republican Study Committee? Well, it might interest you to know, Mr. Speaker, that just 2 months ago, the Republican Study Committee issued a budget for 2025. Again, this is a committee that has 80 percent of the Republican Conference in its membership. This backward budget plan is incredibly revealing.

What does it do? It upends critical programs that American families depend on, makes draconian cuts to Medicare and Social Security with a plan that increases the retirement age to 69, forcing Americans to work longer for less, a plan that cuts disability benefits and erodes care for children, making it more expensive to care for our families.

Their plan raises Medicare costs for seniors, takes away the program's ability to negotiate prescription drug costs, and repeals the \$35 insulin and the \$2,000 out-of-pocket caps that House Democrats, the Members gathered here on the floor this evening, fought so vigorously to enact in the 117th Congress.

Just to be clear, Mr. Speaker, although we are here tonight to talk

about Social Security and Medicare and our efforts to protect, strengthen, and expand both of those programs, and Republican efforts to dismantle them, it is worth noting that this is Police Week. Notwithstanding the many statements made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle concerning their purported support of law enforcement, their budget tells a very different story. Why? How? I encourage every American to go to page 148 of the Republican Study Committee's budget. What you will find is clear, unambiguous, plain language that states that they would like to reduce funding for community-oriented policing services, the COPS Program, a program that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has fought to expand for years, a program that is funding the hiring of law enforcement officers in my district in Colorado and countless other jurisdictions across our great country, a program that is critical to law enforcement's abilities to provide for public safety in our country, and a program that they intend to cut.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, insofar as one were to glean essential observation from a review, a cursory review of their budget, it is simple: House Republicans are uninterested in tackling issues that matter to the American people.

We will not let them cut Social Security. We won't let them cut Medicare. We won't let them cut law enforcement funding. That much is clear.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, our esteemed leader, for his contribution. I would point out as well that the repeal of WEP and GPO, which directly impacts police officers and firefighters, is contained within our proposal. It needs a vote.

Social Security has no impact on the debt or deficit and, as President Biden has proposed, is fully paid for by—most Americans don't even realize this—lifting the cap on people making over \$400,000. Doing so allows us to enhance the program for the first time in 20-plus years and also makes sure that we extend the solvency of the program.

Someone who knows that extraordinarily well is the gentleman from New Jersey, who also serves on the Social Security Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSON for putting his work and soul on the line for the last several years.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the more than 124,000 constituents in the Ninth District of north Jersey who rely on Social Security each and every month.

Social Security is one of America's greatest success stories. After nearly 90 years, it still stands as a monument to decency, dignity, and the birthright of hardworking Americans.

Yet, throughout its storied history, it has been under attack. Going back

to 1935, it has been the subject of attacks and lies from day one. The Republican Study Committee just referred to, which represents three-quarters of the House Republicans, proposed slashing Social Security benefits by \$718 billion.

If I was sitting at home right now, I would be asking if that means me. Does that mean my benefits, which I have paid into? They are going to vote now and take it away? It is the only thing I live on.

Republican leadership wants to create a so-called fiscal commission in our government funding bill. That is a wolf in sheep's clothing. Without aggressive action, Social Security lurches toward insolvency. Congress has a sacred responsibility to fight for its future.

That is why I am standing with Representative LARSON on his Social Security 2100 Act to ensure the long-term strength and solvency of Social Security. I will keep standing as long as we have to fight. We are not going home. The Social Security 2100 Act provides paid-for benefit enhancements while not raising taxes on middle-class families. It is a no-brainer.

Our bill ends the painful 5-month disability waiting period. Imagine that. It would ensure Americans suffering with permanent disorders like Huntington's disease get the help they need without red tape or delay.

The bill eliminates the windfall elimination provision so that firefighters, police, teachers, and others get the full benefits that they have earned.

With the Social Security 2100 Act, we are fighting for our seniors who have worked their entire lives and rely on Social Security to make ends meet.

I remember the first congressional election I ran in, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1996—which wasn't yesterday. I remember I walked into the hall of seniors in the spring of that year before the election actually was on. I thought I knew everything about Social Security, but I never expected to get the first question about Social Security. I was asked: What are you going to do about Social Security? One of our seniors asked that question in 1996, and here we are, 28 years later. What do you know?

I will not vote for a convenient increase in the age requirement. They want seniors to work and drop dead so that they collect under the ground, I guess. They won't be above ground.

I will not vote for cuts of Social Security in order to pay for it.

We are fighting for working families. We must get this done for the American people. There are no excuses.

Those watching, call in. Let us know what you think. This is your money, our money.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to Speaker JOHNSON that he has 158,000 Social Security recipients in his district, and in Louisiana, they receive \$233 million in monthly benefits. Think about what

that does for economic development for those people. Where do they spend that money?

LINDA SÁNCHEZ knows this. LINDA SÁNCHEZ, who also serves on the Ways and Means Committee and on the subcommittee, understands how vitally important this is and also that more than 5 million of our Americans receive below-poverty-level checks from Social Security after having paid into the system all of their lives. The majority of them happen to be women, and the majority of them are women of color.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague JOHN LARSON, who has been at the forefront of advocating for changes to the Social Security system that will ensure its longevity for the next generation and generations to come and will increase the benefits for those who currently receive Social Security.

In contrast, the Republicans are proposing cuts to Social Security, and those cuts will harm millions of Americans.

Make no mistake, cutting Social Security is a direct attack on the Latino population in this country. Social Security benefits are a significant portion of retirement income for Latinos. Forty-two percent of Latino couples and 59 percent of unmarried Latino individuals rely on Social Security for 90 percent or more of their retirement income.

Yet, my Republican colleagues are hellbent on cutting those Social Security benefits. Their proposed budget would cut Social Security benefits for 253 million people, and Latino communities, sadly, will pay the price.

Without Social Security, 47 percent of Latino retirees would be living in poverty. Mr. LARSON frequently says that Social Security is the most successful antipoverty program that this country has ever created.

In contrast to Republicans, who want to cut Social Security or increase the age at which you can begin to draw on it, Democrats are committed to protecting all people from living in poverty. Democrats want to invest in programs like Social Security so that more Americans, including Latinos, can afford to retire.

One of the ingenious parts of Social Security 2100 will increase the cap for those who pay into the Social Security system. I frequently give this example. I think it is important. Many Americans don't know that once you earn above a certain income, you stop paying into the Social Security system. That means that a professional athlete, like, say, a professional baseball player who makes millions of dollars a year in income, in their first at-bat of the season, they hit that cap and pay no more money into Social Security the rest of the year.

I think that we can fix Social Security, increase its longevity, and protect communities like the Latino commu-

nities and the women who depend predominantly on Social Security for their retirement income. All we are asking for is a vote on this legislation.

I have no doubt that if we put that bill on the floor, it would pass by a large margin. Give us a vote.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for again highlighting what we are asking for: a vote. Imagine the United States Congress actually voting.

Here is the deal: If you have a better idea, please bring it to the floor. Let's vote on it. Don't we all agree that this is something that all Americans need?

Republicans in their hearts know that the American people desperately need this. I know Representative JODEY ARRINGTON understands this on the Budget Committee. More than 50 years since we have enhanced a program for the people of this country is outrageous.

□ 1915

You can embrace tax cuts for billionaires as though they needed them, and yet, a tax cut for a person working, who still finds themselves working after they retire, is double taxed on their Social Security.

There should be outrage on this floor and demanding a vote. God only knows that if you have got a better idea or a better program, please put it forward. Let's do the democratic thing, and vote on it.

The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. AMO) campaigned on this throughout his effort to be successfully elected to the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. AMO).

Mr. AMO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that is deeply personal to me and many Americans, the sacred trust of Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I was raised by a mom who worked double shifts as a nurse in Rhode Island in nursing homes. I grew up understanding how critical Medicare and Social Security are for seniors in the Ocean State.

Now, as the Congressman for Rhode Island's First Congressional District, I am committed to expanding the promise of these critical programs.

Democrats know how to get this done.

Through the landmark Inflation Reduction Act, Congress authorized Medicare to negotiate the price of prescription drugs, capping the cost of insulin for seniors at just \$35 a month and limiting out-of-pocket expenses to \$2,000 a year.

This Congress, we have committed to Congressman LARSON's Social Security 2100 Act, a bill that would shore up benefits by ensuring the wealthiest Americans play by the same rules as everyone else.

Yet, as I stand here today, I can't help but contrast these essential measures with the callous budget proposal on the other side of the aisle.

Make no mistake, the Republican Study Committee's proposal is a backward budget. If enacted, it would cut Social Security benefits for more than 250 million Americans nationwide.

In my home State of Rhode Island, the Republican budget slashes benefits for 74 percent of the population, forcing three out of every four residents to work longer for less.

In a similar way, Republicans propose undoing the Inflation Reduction Act and jacking up the price of prescription drugs that seniors rely on.

No one, and I mean no one, should ever have to doubt if Social Security and Medicare will be there for them in their retirement. That is why I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come together. Let's save Social Security together by passing Congressman LARSON's bill.

Let's expand, not repeal, the healthcare savings that Medicare seniors have seen under the Inflation Reduction Act.

Most importantly, let's abandon this misguided idea that punishing seniors, pushing austerity cuts, and raising costs is somehow the solution to the problems we face.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have to choose between ensuring solvency and safeguarding the benefits of millions of Americans. We can and we should do both. By having a vote on the Social Security 2100 Act, we will.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his comments, and I wanted to say this, as well, that this is a bill that was constructed by more than 350 different groups across this great country and by Members of this body who put together their ideas.

The Ways and Means Committee merely took the great ideas of our colleagues and put them together—ideas that have been endorsed by the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Social Security Works, the Alliance for Retired Americans, the California Alliance for Retired Americans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Strengthen Social Security Coalition, the NAACP, and the list goes on.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL) understands this, and Florida probably leads the country in terms of the number of seniors that it has in their districts. As we pointed out before to the Speaker, every district receives money—\$364 million a month, but it has been that way for more than 50-plus years. These programs need to be enhanced and extended, not cut.

The provision by the Republican Study Committee, if there is nothing done by 2034, Social Security is cut by 20 percent. Instead, they are calling to raise the age now and cut Social Security by 21 percent today. How does that possibly make any sense?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL) who understands this.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSON for his leadership on this issue, and I thank Mr. NEGUSE for getting us here.

I think I have joined Mr. LARSON on this discussion for about 10 years or more now.

I want to tell you about one of my constituents. Her name is Janet Zweiback. She is in her eighties. She lives in Delray Beach, Florida. She is retired. She lost her dad at a very early age, and so, she watched her mom struggle with their own family bills. To help the family, Janet began working at the age of 17. Now, I have to get my math right. She has been working 50 years, so I guess that makes her—I don't know, someone add that up for me.

Here is the point: Let me tell you some of the things that she has done over these years. She was a nurse working in a hospital, working countless hours taking care of patients. She moved to Florida, and she became a director of a skilled nursing facility. Then she worked with Alzheimer's patients at Alzheimer's Community Care, probably one of the most difficult assignments a healthcare provider could have. She also managed one of the crisis center hotlines.

She retired about 8 years ago and now is one of the 66 million Americans, almost 200,000 seniors in my district—or as I like to say, seasoned adults; we are seasoned adults in my home district of Palm Beach County—relying on Social Security to meet their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I liked the point Mr. LARSON made that not only does Social Security meet the needs of so many of these seniors, but our seniors are great economic generators. I know where I live, if not for the seniors' economic activity, we would be in pretty bad shape.

Janet told me that she fears that without Social Security she would have to turn to her children somewhat like her mother turned to her when she was young.

Here it is. She has worked her whole life paying into Social Security to get benefits. She and millions of other Americans, nurses, schoolteachers, janitors, construction workers, they worked under the sacred promise that when they turned 65, they would be able to retire with comfort and dignity.

Now House Republicans want to break that promise.

Their recently proposed budget slashes Social Security benefits, raises the retirement age, raises Medicare costs, all while promising another giant tax break for their wealthy friends and large corporations. I will say this, and I hope we all agree, that no one who works their entire life should retire into poverty.

Social Security is an earned benefit that Americans have already paid for with each and every one of their pay-

checks, and President Biden and House Democrats and Senators are committed to defending it from Republican cuts and securing it with meaningful legislation that requires our wealthiest citizens to pay their fair share.

I am proud to stand here with my colleagues standing up for Social Security, keeping it secure, and honoring our most seasoned citizens.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her comments, and I reiterate that all we are asking for is a vote.

For those citizens tuned in to C-SPAN and listening tonight, if you are saying, What do you mean? Why is it that you can't get a vote on this in the United States Congress? Good question. Call your Representative and ask them why they aren't voting to improve a program that hasn't been enhanced in more than 50 years.

We hear from the other side all the time about what we need to do in terms of cuts. Imagine, this is what they would like to cut. If they have got a better idea, they should bring it to the floor. The way a democracy works is it is a debate about ideas, and then there is actually a vote that is cast.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) understands this and understands how important the money coming into her district is monthly, as well.

She understands how vitally important Social Security is to our economy, and not just to our retirees, but to our disabled and to their spouses and to children. The genius of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is what keeps entrepreneurialism and capitalism alive and allows people to take risks is because they know that there is a safety net there for its people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, in New Mexico, we care for our elders. It is a part of our culture. It is a part of who we are because our elders are the people who birthed us, who raised us, who cared for us. They are our grandparents and our parents, our aunts and our uncles, our veterans, the people who carry our histories, our cultures, our languages, and our traditions.

That is why it is so outrageous to me as a New Mexican that the House GOP would even consider, no less propose, to gut the critical programs that support our elders—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

In New Mexico, thousands of New Mexicans depend on Social Security—our seniors, our elders, people living with disabilities. Over 450,000 New Mexicans depend on Medicare. That is over 20 percent of our State's population. New Mexicans depend on these programs to access lifesaving healthcare, to provide for their families, to put a roof over their head, to put food on the table.

Before Social Security, our elders were left with nothing. Before Medicaid and Medicare, our seniors and our low-income families could not access lifesaving healthcare.

□ 1930

In New Mexico, over 12 percent of our seniors are considered low-income and living below the poverty line. Thousands are struggling to maintain housing, to have basic services, to have a roof over their head, and to put food on their table.

Let me be clear: these programs save lives, and they have secured our elders for generations.

New Mexicans and all Americans should be able to live without fear that politicians here in Washington are going to use their lives for political gain, but here we are on the House floor. The GOP is playing politics with the lives of our seniors proposing to gut the fundamental programs that have supported them for generations.

We already know what happens when Federal programs are cut. Hospitals close, food insecurity rises, and critical programs disappear. That is why we are fighting as House Democrats and the Biden administration to protect our seniors, to protect these programs, and to ensure that they are there for generations to come.

That is why we are fighting to protect Social Security and our healthcare services. It is why we took on Big Pharma 2 years ago and won. It is why we passed the Inflation Reduction Act which has the largest single expansion of Medicaid since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. It is why we fought to lower prescription drug costs. It is why we capped insulin prices for every American, and it is why I fought in the State legislature to end State taxes on Social Security benefits in New Mexico.

I ask my colleagues: Is this how you care for your elders?

Is this how they taught you and raised you?

Are these the values that you were raised with?

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is not how we treat our elders in New Mexico because we know they depend on these programs and because we know about the lifesaving care and support that are necessary. We know that we cannot break the promises to those who cared for us and raised us.

Democrats understand, just like New Mexicans, that we must care for our seniors. That is why we are fighting back and working every day to make sure that we secure their well-being.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for her eloquence.

There is no one more eloquent or well-versed on this subject than the deaness of the House of Representatives. She is someone who has lived and breathed this issue and has stood up when the other side has referred to Social Security as an entitlement. It is

not an entitlement. It is an earned benefit that people have paid for.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing they have to do is look at their pay stub, because on it, it says FICA. That stands for Federal insurance. It is not an entitlement. It is a Federal Insurance Contributions.

Whose?

The people of the United States of America who have paid into this program and that Congress has not enhanced.

This debate is not only about protecting Social Security, it is about expanding benefits that haven't been expanded in more than 50 years.

I commend President Biden for having the courage and the temerity on this floor in the State of the Union message to speak directly to the American people and even those colleagues on the other side who try to decry the efforts of Social Security and the President's plan to make sure that it is solvent by lifting the cap—imagine that, Mr. Speaker—on people making over \$400,000.

MARCY KAPTUR understands this thoroughly when she talks to people in Ohio who are infuriated and who say: Well, wait a minute, you are telling me that a person making \$50,000, \$75,000, and \$100,000 pays throughout the year, but somebody making over \$400,000 is done paying in January?

Or as Ms. SANCHEZ said, a baseball player after their first at bat?

Nobody has fought harder for working people than the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. LARSON, for his persevering leadership on this critical issue to millions and millions and millions of Americans and Assistant Leader NEGUSE for his leadership. I thank them for being here this evening.

I appreciate Mr. LARSON yielding me time to highlight the importance of Social Security but also his tireless work to safeguard and ensure coverage in Social Security for all Americans who qualify for their earned benefits which the gentleman and every single Member who got up here tonight have talked about this evening.

This is not a welfare program. This is an earned benefit.

For nearly a century, America has made a sacred promise: Those who work hard throughout their lives will benefit from the fruits of their labor during their retirement.

Social Security promises the safe and secure retirement for tens of millions of Americans during their golden years. However, we are here tonight because without action by this House leading, that promise is at risk.

Like my colleagues, I represent probably over 150,000 retirees, the majority women, in northwest Ohio who want to see responsible solutions to protect Social Security going forward. For Ohio

that includes eliminating the windfall penalty.

I agree with Congressman LARSON. The billionaire class must join the vast majority of Americans in paying their fair share into this critical system. Yes, it is a retirement system, but it is also an insurance system, it is a disability system, and it is a survivorship system for children.

By making that happen, the Social Security 2100 Act championed by Congressman LARSON will increase benefits for current and new beneficiaries. It will protect retirees against inflation, and it will repeal the windfall elimination provision once and for all.

The Social Security 2100 Act is one of the most important bills before this Congress, and we must push leadership for a vote on this House floor as soon as possible. It impacts 68 million beneficiaries.

Already there are 184 House cosponsors of this bill, and Speaker JOHNSON could move this bill to the floor for a vote tomorrow. Additionally, the Social Security Fairness Act has 319 bipartisan cosponsors, more than two-thirds of the Chamber, and they can't get a vote. It is stopped up in the leadership.

America made a promise to workers, and Democrats are committed to making good on that promise.

I am a granddaughter of immigrants who worked at the lowest wage and worst jobs. First fired; last hired. They simply could not have existed if it were not for Social Security in their retirement years. The same is true for our parents.

You see, Mr. Speaker, Social Security is not just a program. It is a trust, a sacred trust, and that trust is intergenerational.

I may be the only Member here this evening who was present in the 98th Congress in April of 1983 to vote for the refinancing of Social Security Title 2 for the next generation. It was among the most critical votes I ever cast, and I remember it to this day. We stood on this floor, and we cheered. That vote was extremely important because it refinanced Social Security for the first time in a generation.

It left some work undone, which we must repair, but it resulted from a brokered compromise between Republican President Ronald Reagan and House Speaker Tip O'Neill. They knew how to compromise.

Now, Congress must meet its responsibility to do the same for this generation and those that follow.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that we place in the RECORD information about that brokered compromise and also reports from U.S. News and World Report and other materials that attend to that extraordinary moment in history.

Let's get the job done. We ask Speaker JOHNSON to bring up H.R. 2100 for a vote.

I thank Congressman LARSON, Congressman NEGUSE, and Congressman

CARTWRIGHT, who are here this evening as part of this important messaging to the American people to say: The time is now. Bring up H.R. 2100.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his extraordinary and persevering leadership.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio. She mentioned Mr. CARTWRIGHT who I think epitomizes the concern that exists in this body, in the Congress, for people who go back home every week and meet with their constituents.

The constituents of Pennsylvania are fortunate that they have someone who understands their needs and understands the neglect that Congress has shown in not addressing the number one anti-poverty program for elderly and for children in this country.

As difficult as times are now, we need to make sure that minimally we have a vote. I do not understand the reluctance on the other side to bring forward legislation and actually vote on it. If you have got a better idea, Mr. Speaker, or even if you object to the plan, please tell us what it is that you object to, and what it is about Social Security and making sure that nobody works all their lives and pays into a system and then retires into poverty.

MATT CARTWRIGHT understands that. He understands his district in Pennsylvania and the importance of getting this legislation done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member LARSON for yielding. I wonder if he would submit himself to a few questions and engage in a colloquy.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The first question I have, and we heard it tonight, we heard the statement, the assertion that Social Security for generations has been the single most important income support program in America and has lifted millions upon millions of seniors out of poverty.

Is that true?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Yes, it is.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. We have also heard talk about this Republican Study Committee, which is a group of 80 percent of the Republicans here in the United States House of Representatives, and it is a committee that came up with a proposal about Social Security to raise the retirement age and require seniors to continue working into their senior years.

Is that true?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Not only is it true, but I think what the general public needs to understand, and as you point out, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, the saying goes like this: Well, people are living longer, so, therefore, because they are living longer, what we ought to do is raise the age.

What the study committee doesn't tell you is that for every year you raise the age, that is a 7 percent cut in benefits. Oh, so if you raise the age to 70, that is a 21 percent cut in your benefits going forward.

How is it, from just mere logic, that if you are living longer you need to live on 21 percent less?

The American people understand this, and that is why they are so upset, but that is why, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, we need a vote.

□ 1945

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have one final question for Ranking Member LARSON.

This idea of raising the retirement age, as the gentleman has explained very well, constitutes a cut in benefits for every year Republicans raise it. Economists have worked out how much that is going to cost out of the Social Security system.

The majority's plan is to raise the retirement age and cut Social Security benefits by \$1.5 trillion, with a t. That is what happens when you raise the retirement age to 69 the way Republicans want to. Is that right?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. That is correct.

I guess the sad thing is that this needs a vote. It needs a debate. Philosophically, if you believe—and God bless, some on the other side do believe this is some form of socialism and that everybody ought to be able to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps and be able to make do for themselves, that you don't need the government to do anything for you even when you have paid in all of your life to a program that has been the greatest American program to sustain our elderly and children.

If you disagree with that, that is terrific, but let's then take that to the American people. Where do you do that? On the floor of the House of Representatives, where you actually will debate the issue and put forward your proposals versus ours.

Isn't that the way democracy is supposed to work, Mr. CARTWRIGHT?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Ranking Member LARSON has that right, and I thank the gentleman for answering my questions.

Tonight, I am here to speak on behalf of 191,000 people from northeastern Pennsylvania who depend on Social Security checks coming in to keep them alive. Probably over 40 percent of them look to those checks as the only visible means of support that they have.

Now, the Republican Study Committee's fiscal year 2025 proposal comes along and talks about raising the retirement age to 69. That is fine if, like us, you fly a desk for a living, but if you do what so many Americans do, the people who paid paycheck after paycheck after paycheck into this sacred promise, this insurance program, FICA, if you do what they do—they have to lift and climb and carry and

dig. These are the people doing manual labor, and they are expected to work well into their senior years, according to the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a breach of a promise. It is a betrayal of the Americans who paid into this system their entire working lives. It is unacceptable, and it is something that the Republicans have done year in and year out.

Remember when, in 2006, Republicans were proposing privatizing the entire Social Security system, saying that will free up people to invest their money in the stock market. Then what happened to the stock market a couple of years later? It cratered. People would have lost their entire lifesavings, and there would have been no checks of any nature coming into their post office boxes.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is not cutting benefits. The answer is Social Security 2100, Mr. LARSON's bill, something that I have proudly supported for over 10 years now.

This bill would increase benefits by 2 percent for all Social Security beneficiaries for the first time in 52 years. It would eliminate the WEP, which hurts policemen, firemen, prison correctional officers, all sorts of public employees.

Rather than cutting benefits, Representative LARSON and the Democratic Party have a plan to protect and enhance Social Security. It is a plan to put people over politics and make good on our promise to put American seniors first and pass Social Security 2100.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, my good friend JODEY ARRINGTON—and I sincerely mean that when I say that. A lot of times on this floor, we say "good friend," but I appreciate the effort that he puts into his work.

I bring these cards here this evening just to point out to our colleagues what it is. We made one for every Member of Congress. This is just a direct plea: Understand what is going on in your district because of Social Security.

Citizens have every right to ask why Congress hasn't done anything to enhance this program, Democrats and Republicans, in more than 50 years, especially when we know how vital this program is to our own system of capitalism and entrepreneurialism and what it means to every single one of our communities.

There is not a better economic development program that Texas will receive than the individuals in everyone's district receiving their Social Security checks. They are not going out and buying stock options. They are buying groceries. They are going to the pharmacy. They are going to the dry cleaners. They are paying their rent and mortgages. They are meeting the concerns in their communities. In doing so, those communities can thrive. It is long overdue—more than 50 years.

All we are asking for is a vote. If you have a better idea, in a democracy, the way I was brought up, you put it out there, and then, lo and behold, we actually have a vote—a vote that requires a debate and a discussion and then Congress demonstrating what it believes in by actually casting a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) for a final comment.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say one of the many privileges I have in serving as assistant Democratic leader is having the opportunity to see firsthand the way in which my colleagues in the House Democratic Caucus are able to convert their passion and conviction on consequential public policy issues into action. That is precisely what the gentleman from Connecticut has done for the better part of the last decade, from when he first introduced this legislation.

I am proud to support it. I am proud to support his efforts to protect and enhance Social Security and to do everything that we can to ensure that our colleagues' plans on the other side of the aisle to dismantle this program never see the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and friend from Connecticut for yielding.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

DEMOCRATS ARE DESTROYING AMERICAN DREAM, RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I notice it must be campaign season. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trotting out the age-old push-granny-off-the-cliff campaign talking points. It never fails.

If my colleagues want to have a conversation about how to save Social Security, the trustees just put a report out this week or last week pointing out that it is going to be underwater by 2033. The minority wants to ignore that reality. Instead of figuring out how we are actually going to deal with the problem, Democrats trot out the same old story about taxes.

By any objective measure, by any analysis by left, right, center, Libertarian, conservative, or liberal, you can tax literally the entirety of the top 1 percent of earners, but it can't possibly balance the budget. Literally, the math doesn't work.

We can throw all this around in election-year rhetoric, but the truth is our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not just watching Social Security

go bankrupt, but they are bankrupt in ideas on what to do about it.

The fact is you have to actually constrain spending, discretionary spending, deal with the issues we ought to deal with on mandatory spending, and recognize the fact that we are \$34.5 trillion in debt. We are racking up \$1 trillion every 3 months. We are now going to crack \$1.1 trillion of interest this year alone—\$1.1 trillion of interest, which is far more than our entire defense budget.

The fact is our retirees are going to have a problem in 2033. In fact, this trustee's report pointed out that they will be getting 79 cents on the dollar in 2033. We can have a conversation about what you want to do about taxes, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are all too happy to regulate and crush the entire American economy to death and drive up inflation, making all those Social Security recipients have less value in their Social Security dollars. That is the truth.

The average American can't afford to live, whether they are earning money in the prime of their earning potential, in their earning years, or whether they are a retiree because the dollar value is decreasing because we are printing money because, frankly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no interest in actually being fiscally responsible—I am an equal opportunity basher of fiscal responsibility—nor do my colleagues on this side of the aisle, to be honest.

It is a repeating problem that never ends, but it is my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, my radical progressive Democratic colleagues—and there is no other way to characterize them—who want to use scare tactics in a campaign year rather than addressing any of the actual fiscal issues that affect our Nation.

The fact is that Democrats are destroying the American Dream, killing the ability of the average American family to prosper. Hardworking American families right now are struggling to pay bills, struggling to be able to buy a car. Why? Because we have regulated them to death. Why? Because, chasing climate fantasy, we are killing the ability of an American to go buy a car with an internal combustion engine.

We are piling up EVs on the lots of dealerships around the country. We are now embracing, because the Biden administration unilaterally embraced, a tailpipe rule that will mandate EV production, two-thirds of the fleet being produced by 2030.

My colleagues are crushing the American Dream before our very eyes.

That is what has happened. The so-called Inflation Reduction Act, mandating massive subsidies of so-called green programs, is actually subsidizing China and the massive corporations that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle decry.

Democrats want to increase the corporate tax rate, which will punish

hardworking Americans who are trying to create wealth relative to corporations around the world, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to undo the massive corporate subsidies they gave to Green New Deal recipients.

That is the truth, and it is destroying the average American's ability to live. Let's be very clear. Right now, Americans are hurting because of Democratic policies. Right now, Americans can't buy a car, can't go out and afford groceries, can't pay their power bills. Why? Because of my radical progressive Democratic colleagues and their policies regulating our entire economy to death and destroying the average American family.

Let's not talk about the price of homes, the price of real estate. All these things are things that are increasingly highly and heavily regulated. That is problem number one.

Let's talk about what our radical progressive Democratic colleagues are doing to destroy the rule of law. The rule of law is the single greatest thing that attracts people to come to the United States, the single greatest thing that attracts capital to create wealth and to create opportunity. It is the single greatest thing that has distinguished the United States of America and Western civilization from the rest of the world for now centuries, particularly since the founding of this Nation.

□ 2000

The fact is, the rule of law is being destroyed by my radical, progressive Democratic colleagues, it is purposefully being destroyed. This week, we have bills on the floor, and we are talking a lot about our police, our law enforcement officers, but it is not about a week. Weeks are stupid.

We come down here and we do all these things. We do ribbons and we do all these things that say, Oh, we are going to have a week. The fact is every week is police week. Every week our cops are in danger. Every week our cops are being undermined by radical progressives in cities around this country, endangering the people in communities while endangering the law enforcement who are supposed to protect them every single week—not just this one—every week.

Last year, November 2023, in Austin—a city which defunded our police by \$150 million, driving down the number of cops. We are now at least 350, if not 500, below the level that we were supposed to be at, the level we were at before COVID because we don't have the ability to recruit law enforcement after decimating the budget. That was the radical city council, led by radical, progressive Democrats in Austin, which are reflected and mirrored by the radical, progressive Democrats sitting right here in this Chamber like CORI BUSH who said we should defund the police, like the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. NADLER,

who signed a letter along with our colleague, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, saying we should defund the Metropolitan Transit Authority in New York. They signed that letter.

I asked the ranking member in the Rules Committee last night: How is that working out? How safe does New York feel? How safe is the subway system in New York City? Because right now I think there is a whole hell of a lot of people in New York and around this country who are looking at New York and they are saying: What happened? There is a whole hell of a lot of people who are looking at the Nation's Capital saying: How can I come see my Representatives and come to the Nation's Capital and feel like I am going to be safe?

Last year in Austin, where the radical, progressive Democrats on the city council defunded the police, we saw the unfortunate tragic shooting of police officer Jorge Pastore, who is a hero, who was shot and killed in the line of duty last November.

In San Antonio, we had three San Antonio police officers who were shot during a standoff with an armed career criminal who had absconded after getting bond and was wanted on multiple charges. Why? Because the radical, progressive Democrat DAs and the radical, progressive Democrat judges all funded by Soros, all-purposeful, all in a network around this country, they let these guys out and then they shot cops. 378 officers were shot in the line of duty in 2023, 138 peace officers died in the line of duty in 2023, 48 by gunfire, 10 by vehicular assault, 7 from a heart attack.

There were 150 ambush-style attacks against police in 2023, which claimed the lives of 20 officers. This year, 58 police officers have died in the line of duty. They are under attack every single day and my radical, progressive Democrat colleagues don't care because they are totally fine defunding them. They want to come to the floor of this body and say it is not true, when there are mountains of evidence saying it is. In fact, 113 of my colleagues voted against the resolution which decried the defunding of cops just last year.

In Austin, crime is skyrocketing. Seventy-three homicides in 2023 up from 71 in 2022. The highest level since going back some 40-odd years, all as a result of defunding the police to the tune of \$150 million. The fallout, as I said, 350 vacancies. The Austin Police Department stopped responding to non-threatening 911 calls in the fall of 2021.

Let's think about that. Austin's crime has increased, and overdoses are skyrocketing, in part, due to the lawlessness of our wide-open borders. You see, the rule of law doesn't matter to my radical, progressive Democratic colleagues. The rule of law is being undermined, the safety and security of the people that I represent is being undermined, and it is being made worse.

The fact is, now, we have a fentanyl crisis all across this country and, par-

ticularly, in places like Austin, Texas, where just 2 weeks ago, we had—I don't even know the exact number—but there were 75 reported cases of individuals overdosing in a matter of a 72-hour stretch, killing at least nine people. I can't remember the number of people they had to resuscitate by Narcan. It is the largest fentanyl poisoning in Austin for over a decade, and it is happening because this stuff is pouring across our southern border, which brings me to a point: the rule of law.

The rule of law, being undermined by our radical Democratic colleagues, who are undermining cops, defunding cops, the same radical, progressive Democratic colleagues who are leaving our border wide open and exposed, blatantly disregarding the law, undermining the rule of law, the very rule of law that attracts immigrants to come to our country and we have police officers killed by illegal aliens.

In March 2024, an illegal alien from Mexico was charged with crashing his car that killed a 27-year-old Washington State Trooper.

New York police officers were assaulted by a mob of illegal aliens. Five illegal aliens savagely assaulted two officers. The suspects were back on the streets without bail. I think they have been recently given some very minor sentences.

Let's never forget DUI fatalities as a result of those who are here illegally, including in Kerr County, which I represent in Texas, where you had a drunk, illegal alien crashing into members of the Thin Blue Line Motorcycle Club, made up of Active-Duty service-members, law enforcement officers, and retired officers, killing retired Officer Joseph Paglia of Chicago, United States Army Lieutenant Colonel Jerry Wayne Harbour of Houston, and retired U.S. Army Officer Michael White of Chicago.

Right here in our Nation's Capital, it has become a region of lawlessness and disorder. Crime in D.C. is up 30 percent. Violent crime up 37 percent from 2022 to 2023. We had one of our own Members of Congress who was carjacked just 10 blocks from here, another Member of Congress who was assaulted. We have had staff members, such as the staff member of Senator RAND PAUL who was stabbed. We had a teenage gunman just a few weeks ago spraying AR-15 rounds and then pretty much was just let go.

This is the state of things in our Nation's Capital. It is the state of things in New York City. It is the state of things across our country. It is a return to lawlessness. If you don't have the rule of law, what do you have?

When you let violent criminals out of jail, what do you think is going to happen? By the way, there are people on my side of the aisle who are guilty of that. In the false name of compassion, we are letting people out on the streets who are endangering our own people.

The rule of law matters and you can't have the rule of law if cops can't

enforce the rule of law and then be abandoned by the very people that are supposed to support them, and that is what is happening. You can't have the rule of law if the borders are wide open.

If you are ignoring the law, parole—which is supposed to be on a case-by-case basis—to pump thousands of people into our country, including, by the way, the individual who killed Laken Riley. He was unlawfully paroled into the United States by this administration. But guess what? There wasn't any consequence, except for Laken Riley, who is no longer with us.

That is what happened. That is the truth. It is lawlessness. Ignoring the rule of law, endangering the American people, and now you have the rank lawlessness of a sham trial against the former President in New York.

A bootstrap charge that relies on an unreliable witness being presided over by a biased judge. That is the truth, and anybody with eyes knows it. It is not the rule of law; it is the use of the law for political purposes and gain. It is, as some refer to it, "lawfare" against the former President of the United States.

I don't care what you think of President Trump, President Biden, anybody else, when you weaponize our system of justice for political purposes, you are nothing more than a third-rate banana republic. That is precisely what is happening in the State of New York right now by a lawless judge, a biased judge—who, frankly, should be investigated himself—who is targeting the former President for political purposes.

It is clearly obvious. No citizen, no citizen would be treated to the same attack as what is happening right now to former President Trump.

I am not afraid to call out Members on both sides of the aisle. I am not afraid to call about President Biden. I am not afraid to call out former President Trump. I am not paid to be a loyalist. I am not paid to be biased. I am not paid to wear a red shirt versus a blue shirt.

I am paid to represent 750,000 Texans, to follow the Constitution, to honor my duty to the Lord, and to do my job. That is what I am paid to do. But to watch the former President of the United States being hauled into court day after day with a sham trial, and you cannot describe it as anything but a sham trial.

The DA's office previously determined that its theory of criminal liability under New York law would not hold up. That is the truth. So they bootstrapped it into a felony because, frankly, it would have been time-barred if they hadn't done that. You have got to have the felony charge proving that Trump was concealing another crime. That is why they are now trying to pull in a Federal campaign charge, but the campaign laws in question are Federal and when New York's penal code speaks of concealing another crime, it must refer to a crime

under New York law, but they are trying to bootstrap it into Federal law. That is the truth.

It is hard to see how the government could meet the burden of proof. According to my good friend, Andy McCarthy, a former Federal prosecutor, he wrote that: "... not unless there is as-yet-undisclosed evidence that Trump actually paused to consider the possibility that these payments were in-kind campaign expenditures, believed they might well be, yet went through with them anyway." All bootstrapped Federal law into State crime charges.

Neither the Justice Department nor the Federal Election Commission bureaucrats, whose expertise lies in the operation of the relevant laws, alleged wrongdoing by Trump. Yet here we are.

By the way, the whole theory hinges on Michael Cohen, who is widely viewed to have committed perjury in multiple locations, including before this very body in the House Oversight Committee as Chairman COMER has laid out for the public to see.

By the way, a convicted felon he is. By the way, disbarred he is, previously pleading guilty to perjury, financial crimes, and campaign finance violations.

The Southern District of New York decided it was best not to give him a cooperation agreement because they would have to rely on his testimony. Yet here we are. We have got this case proceeding with Bragg doing it for political purposes all in front of a biased judge.

Judge Merchan refused Trump's legal team's request that he recuse himself over bias because his daughter, Lauren, worked as a Democratic political consultant.

One of our own colleagues, Mr. GOLDMAN—formerly a lawyer for Schiff, Representative SCHIFF, during Trump's first impeachment—is her client, and has also been working to prep Cohen for testimony this week.

By the way, the daughter of the judge has worked for prominent Democrats—Kamala Harris, Gavin Newsom, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, and has made multiple contributions to Democratic campaigns. Meanwhile, Bragg continues.

This whole sham of a trial undermines the rule of law and the faith of the American people in it. You do not have to love the political target, in this case, former President Trump to recognize the extraordinary damage that this is doing to the rule of law and our institutions. By the way, the purposeful damage that is attempting to be done is to President Trump himself. That is the purpose.

□ 2015

Not allowing this kangaroo court in New York to undermine his ability to continue to campaign to try to garner the votes necessary to win in November, come in here and clean up the mess that is being created by the lawless Biden administration.

The Biden administration is engaging in lawless behavior on a daily basis, whether it is student loans, ignoring the courts, wide-open borders, fentanyl pouring into our communities, perpetuating this undermining of cops, that is all happening in real time. It is hard to keep up with the rampant level of lawlessness coming out of the current administration and the abject failure of my radical, progressive Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do a thing about it.

I might note, as an equal opportunity basher of all Members of Congress, that nor has the Republican side of the aisle really done much to check the current President.

Wide-open borders? Funded.

FBI lawlessness, political witch hunts, weaponized against the people and the former President? \$200 million new headquarters. If you fund it, you own it.

I can tell you that this lawlessness is demonstrably undermining the faith of the American people in the institution of Congress and of our institutions upon which our entire society rests.

Right now, people do not believe that our political system is working. They do not have faith in elections. They do not have faith that our borders are being protected. They do not have faith that our police are being supported, that our streets are safe. They do not have faith in a system of justice that will target a former President for political purposes and a Department of Justice that will be weaponized against the people.

A woman just yesterday or two days ago was sentenced to 57 months in jail, almost 5 years, because she protested at an abortion clinic in Washington, D.C. By the way, a progressive activist. A progressive activist in jail for 57 months. It is extraordinary.

What are we doing about it? We are Congress. It is right here in D.C. Does anybody care about this woman's life? Maybe it is a misdemeanor. Maybe she should pay a fine. I don't know, maybe a misdemeanor like 30 days in jail if she did something that was blocking people's access or something—I don't know—but 5 years in jail under a FACE Act, Federal prosecution? That is extraordinary. Does anybody care about what is happening to the weaponization of government against the people?

Again, do you believe that your Nation is sovereign and secure when our borders are wide open and terrorists and criminals come in? The answer is no.

The county attorney of Kinney County, Texas, was just testifying this week in the Budget Committee, and he said in 2021 they had about 150 prosecutions. Last year, they had 6,700.

My Democratic colleagues shrug that off like it is no big deal. They shrug off the \$13 billion that Texas has to pay to deal with the wide-open borders. They shrug off the death of Laken Riley like it is just some happenstance because

the President is violently disregarding our laws and pumping people into the United States in violation of parole laws.

Our cops are being targeted. They are not being prosecuted. Soros DAs are letting criminals out on the street. We are funding the lawlessness, letting people out on the streets. All of that is continuing while a judge goes after a former President of the United States, while a radical DA in New York, another Soros DA, is going after the former President for clearly political purposes with a sham trial.

All of that is happening. Why would the American people believe in the institutions of this country? You would think we would be doing something to try to restore that. Here we are. There is one thing we can do. One thing we should do to restore some semblance of confidence in our system this year.

House Republicans must pass the SAVE Act. House Republicans have the opportunity to make clear what 87 percent of Americans believe, that only citizens of the United States should vote in elections; and in this case in the SAVE Act, if they vote in Federal elections, they must be a citizen. They must produce documentary evidence of being a citizen of the United States to vote in a Federal election. There is vast bipartisan support across this country—87 percent of Americans—to ensure that you can believe in our system of elections, that only citizens will be voting.

Just last week, my radical, progressive Democratic colleagues unanimously opposed the bill to exclude non-United States citizens from the Census used to allocate congressional seats. Also last week, in a very clearly Freudian slip, President Biden described the millions of illegal aliens he has allowed into the United States as "voters." Washington, D.C., fairly notoriously, just had a training program in April, training people to be able to make it possible for illegal aliens in D.C. to vote.

Now, they will all say, Chip, it is already unlawful for people to vote in Federal elections if they are not a citizen. Do you believe it? Do you believe that the jurisdictions across this country, including the Nation's Capital, including San Francisco, Oakland, and multiple places around this country that have embraced allowing illegal aliens to vote in local and State elections, do you believe that they are being checked to ensure that they are not voting in Federal elections?

Let me tell you this: Current law, in all of our infinite wisdom as Congress—because we get so many things right here—current law put forward by the Congress restricts the ability of States, restricts the ability of States to check to make sure that you are a citizen. True. True story. The brilliance of your United States Congress, they say by law you must be a citizen to vote, but then they say: You, State, can't check to make sure that the voter is a citizen.

Arizona has two systems for voting: State-based. Why? Because they passed a law saying only citizens can vote. They have a system to check. State elections, State races, local races, they are required to check for citizenship for that. For Federal elections, they don't. Now, how messed up is that?

The Constitution gives authority to the Congress to be able to ensure the integrity of our elections. Yes, the States can set the time, place, and manner of how the elections are carried out, but Congress has the power to step in to ensure that our elections are carried out appropriately.

We have a simple bill, the SAVE Act. It has 50-odd cosponsors in the House and growing. My colleague, Senator MIKE LEE, in the Senate introduced it over there. It has multiple cosponsors and growing. This bill is simple—every single Republican should support it, and if they don't support it, they should answer why—should voters in the United States who are voting in Federal elections be citizens of the United States? 87 percent of Americans say yes. Anybody sensible says yes. Should anyone who is going to vote in those Federal elections in Congress, Senate, and for the Presidency, have to demonstrate that they are, in fact, citizens, by presenting a passport, by presenting a voter ID, a real ID from a State-issued driver's license, combined with a birth certificate, other forms that we lay out, like anything else you have to do. If you want to fly in this country, all the things that you have to do to prove you are who you say you are.

To my radical, progressive Democratic colleagues who protest, saying this is crazy, it is already a requirement that you be a citizen to vote. Then what are you afraid of? What are you worried about?

I will tell you what they are worried about. They are worried about making sure it is true. They worry about the fact that the vast majority of my radical, progressive Democratic colleagues would be perfectly fine getting rid of that law requiring citizenship to vote.

We need to call the question. We have a piece of legislation that is supported by vast numbers of election law experts and groups, supported by the Speaker of the House, supported by 50-odd Republicans and growing. This bill needs to be brought forward. It needs to be brought to the House Admin Committee. It needs to be brought to the Rules Committee and to the floor of the House. It needs to be voted out by my Republican colleagues or they need to explain why.

It is a simple question. If you want people to believe in their country, if you want them to believe in the rule of law, if you want them to believe in their system of government, if you want them to believe in the elections of their Representatives and of the President of the United States, so that we can avoid what happened in 2016 when my radical, progressive Demo-

cratic colleagues questioned the election of President Trump over Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and did so vocally and loudly and repeatedly questioning. Again, in 2020, questions about the election; all the way right up and through January.

If you want to get rid of those problems, then make sure our elections are believable. Make sure that you know who is voting and, importantly, make sure that only citizens of the United States of America are voting in Federal elections. This is not a hard question. You either believe it or you don't.

To my Republican colleagues who want to hide behind federalism, don't. The Constitution of the United States is clear: Both in terms of our ability to deal with the election of Members of Congress and the President, as well as issues like naturalization, our power in this area is clear. Our ability to make sure that we can do it without unduly burdening the ability of a citizen to vote is clear. Get busy fixing it if you have got a concern, but don't hide because there is going to be nowhere to hide.

The future of our country depends on the faith the people of the United States have in our institutions. We should support our police. We should support the rule of law. We should put criminals behind bars. We should have a sovereign nation and a secure border. We should know who is here. We should remove illegal aliens. We should secure the border of the United States. We should make sure that only citizens vote in our elections. We should end the dangerous flow of fentanyl into our communities. We should stop countenancing the sham trials and the politicization of our judiciary system against the former President of the United States or the politicization of the Department of Justice against the American people.

If you want to restore the greatness of this country, if you want to create prosperity, if you want to be able to believe in a country, if you want to be able to restore the American Dream and pass it down to our kids and grandkids, the birthright of being an American, it all begins and ends with the rule of law.

The rule of law is why people have come to our country to achieve greatness. They don't come here for free lunches, not historically. Maybe more recently. As the great economist Milton Friedman said, he is all for open borders if you get rid of the social welfare state.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, we have a social welfare state. We need to limit the flow of people coming into the country and taking advantage of the social welfare state. We need to restore sovereignty. We need to make sure that criminals and terrorists aren't coming here. We need to secure the border, end the flow of fentanyl, make sure only citizens vote, support our law enforcement, keep criminals in jail, and keep the American people safe.

If you do that, there is a small chance that if combined with any kind of ounce of fiscal restraint by this body—I will not hold my breath on that one right now—we might be able to save this country for our kids and grandkids.

I want to be very clear, in particular to my Republican colleagues, if you think you are going to hide behind election season, if you think you are going to hide behind talking about what rules go down, what don't go down, if you think you are going to hide behind the Presidential election and the first 100 days of an agenda, if you think you are going to be able to hide behind that to avoid answering to the American people on what we said we would do—cutting spending, balancing the budget, securing the border of the United States, ensuring our military is strong, has the tools to carry out its job with a clear mission and care when they get home, but is sparingly used and not in endless wars, if you want to make sure that you can go to the doctor of your choice, get the healthcare of your choosing and not an insurance bureaucrat, if you want to make sure you can have a car that you can afford and electricity in your home, and if you want to be able to be free from the bureaucracy of a Federal Government strangling the American family, if you want to be able to send your kid to the school of your choice and be able to make sure that they are being taught that America is great and that God is real and that we can do great things, if you want those things, then you have to actually fight for them.

□ 2030

You can't just pass empty bills with empty titles because that is all we do in this damn place every day. We did it today.

We passed multiple bills that won't do a damn thing, all with fancy titles that make it hard for people to vote against whatever that additional spending or additional bureaucracy is.

That is what we did. We did it today. We will do it tomorrow. We will then try to campaign on those empty, non-sense bills.

Why don't we do something that matters? Why don't we actually do one thing we said we would do? Yes, I said it again to my Republican colleagues who excoriated me because of a speech I gave before Thanksgiving saying: Name one thing.

Well, we passed the TikTok bill on a bipartisan basis. We will require China to divest TikTok. I support that, all right.

We have this great SAVE Act we are moving. I hope we can actually pass it off the floor. We haven't done that yet. When are we going to step up to the plate and do the things we said we would do?

Have we cut spending? No. Did we honor the caps to even hold spending? No. Have we secured the border? No.

Have we reined in what I might refer to as endless wars and endless conflict for the last 25 years? We have had a perpetual war, funding other people's wars. No. Have we restored energy freedom? No. Have we restored healthcare freedom, go to the doctor of your choice? No.

When are we going to do one of those things? That is why we are here. That is why the voters sent us here.

We should get busy doing the things that we said we would do, and it all begins and ends with restoring the rule of law in this country: Stand by cops, bad guys in jail, sovereign Nation, stop letting people coming in, stop letting fentanyl come in, require that only citizens vote, and pass the SAVE Act to ensure that we can believe in our elections and that only citizens are voting in them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the chair and not to a perceived viewing office.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Acting Clerk of the House, reported that on May 10, 2024, the following bill was presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 8289. To extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE A COMMITTEE

MAY 15, 2024.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XV, I, W. GREGORY STEUBE, moved to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution, (H. Res. 961), entitled, a resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5863) to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters, which was referred to said committee January 11, 2024, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. W. Gregory Steube.
2. Anna Paulina Luna.
3. Cory Mills.
4. Lauren Boebert.
5. Matt Gaetz.

6. Jared Moskowitz.
7. Gus M. Bilirakis.
8. Kat Cammack.
9. Byron Donalds.
10. Tim Burchett.
11. Doug LaMalfa.
12. Diana Harshbarger.
13. Katie Porter.
14. Jill N. Tokuda.
15. Mike Thompson.
16. Jimmy Panetta.
17. Salud O. Carbajal.
18. Dwight Evans.
19. Robert Garcia.
20. Linda T. Sánchez.
21. Grace F. Napolitano.
22. Juan Vargas.
23. Darren Soto.
24. Doris O. Matsui.
25. Earl Blumenauer.
26. Ted Lieu.
27. Troy A. Carter.
28. Bonnie Watson Coleman.
29. Anna G. Eshoo.
30. James P. McGovern.
31. Mark Takano.
32. Haley M. Stevens.
33. Morgan Luttrell.
34. Danny K. Davis.
35. Raul Ruiz.
36. Clay Higgins.
37. Beth Van Duyne.
38. Mark DeSaulnier.
39. Zoe Lofgren.
40. C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger.
41. J. Luis Correa.
42. Scott Franklin.
43. Jim Costa.
44. Kevin Hern.
45. Mike Levin.
46. Adam B. Schiff.
47. Pete Aguilar.
48. Kevin Mullin.
49. Ami Bera.
50. Eric Swalwell.
51. Brad Sherman.
52. Maxine Waters.
53. Shri Thanedar.
54. Thomas R. Suozzi.
55. Nancy Pelosi.
56. Julia Brownley.
57. Christopher R. Deluzio.
58. Josh Harder.
59. Norma J. Torres.
60. John Garamendi.
61. Tony Cárdenas.
62. Ro Khanna.
63. Betty McCollum.
64. Colin Z. Allred.
65. Judy Chu.
66. Bradley Scott Schneider.
67. Barbara Lee.
68. Debbie Dingell.
69. Troy E. Nehls.
70. Sydney Kamlager-Dove.
71. Debbie Wasserman Schultz.
72. Jimmy Gomez.
73. Nanette Diaz Barragán.
74. Nancy Mace.
75. Daniel T. Kildee.
76. Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick.
77. Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann.
78. Emilia Strong Sykes.
79. Frederica S. Wilson.
80. Jennifer L. McClellan.
81. Hillary J. Scholten.
82. Yvette D. Clarke.
83. Carlos A. Gimenez.
84. Delia C. Ramirez.
85. James E. Clyburn.
86. Robin L. Kelly.
87. Jamie Raskin.
88. Timothy M. Kennedy.
89. Kathy E. Manning.
90. Marc A. Veasey.
91. Mike Carey.
92. Suzan K. DelBene.
93. Diana DeGette.
94. Lisa Blunt Rochester.
95. Vicente Gonzalez.
96. Maxwell Frost.
97. Elissa Slotkin.
98. Marilyn Strickland.
99. Richard E. Neal.
100. Jared Huffman.
101. Joyce Beatty.
102. Shontel M. Brown.
103. Donald S. Beyer.
104. Neal P. Dunn.
105. Tracey Mann.
106. Kim Schrier.
107. Kathy Castor.
108. Andrea Salinas.
109. Becca Balint.
110. Melanie A. Stansbury.
111. Dina Titus.
112. Ilhan Omar.
113. Marcy Kaptur.
114. Jasmine Crockett.
115. Pramila Jayapal.
116. Lloyd Doggett.
117. John B. Larson.
118. Terri A. Sewell.
119. Teresa Leger Fernandez.
120. Val T. Hoyle.
121. Derek Kilmer.
122. Gabe Vasquez.
123. Suzanne Bonamici.
124. Scott H. Peters.
125. Brendan F. Boyle.
126. Warren Davidson.
127. Lori Trahan.
128. David J. Trone.
129. Susan Wild.
130. Matt Cartwright.
131. Bill Pascrell.
132. Sara Jacobs.
133. Deborah K. Ross.
134. Mary Sattler Peltola.
135. Dean Phillips.
136. Nikki Budzinski.
137. Grace Meng.
138. Lois Frankel.
139. Ann M. Kuster.
140. Rosa L. DeLauro.
141. Eric Sorensen.
142. Mary Gay Scanlon.
143. Chrissy Houlahan.
144. Morgan McGarvey.
145. Paul Tonko.
146. Wiley Nickel.
147. Bennie G. Thompson.
148. Frank J. Mrvan.
149. Joseph D. Morelle.
150. David Scott.
151. Jahana Hayes.
152. Alma S. Adams.
153. Sylvia R. Garcia.
154. Madeleine Dean.
155. Valerie P. Foushee.
156. Nydia M. Velázquez.
157. Sanford D. Bishop.
158. Nikema Williams.
159. Donald G. Davis.
160. Steve Cohen.
161. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott.

162. Henry Cuellar.
 163. Gabe Amo.
 164. Lucy McBath.
 165. Jonathan L. Jackson.
 166. Henry C. “Hank” Johnson.
 167. Greg Stanton.
 168. Stephen F. Lynch.
 169. Greg Casar.
 170. Adriano Espaillat.
 171. Joe Neguse.
 172. Steven Horsford.
 173. Lauren Underwood.
 174. Cori Bush.
 175. Maria Elvira Salazar.
 176. Jake Auchincloss.
 177. Robert Menendez.
 178. James A. Himes.
 179. Janice D. Schakowsky.
 180. Jerrold Nadler.
 181. William R. Keating.
 182. Ruben Gallego.
 183. Chellie Pingree.
 184. Kweisi Mfume.
 185. Gregory W. Meeks.
 186. Mark Pocan.
 187. Marjorie Taylor Greene.
 188. Greg Landsman.
 189. Veronica Escobar.
 190. Al Green.
 191. Brian J. Mast.
 192. André Carson.
 193. Mike Garcia.
 194. Gwen Moore.
 195. Daniel S. Goldman.
 196. Katherine M. Clark.
 197. Mike Quigley.
 198. Jamaal Bowman.
 199. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez.
 200. Rick Larsen.
 201. Rashida Tlaib.
 202. Gerald E. Connolly.
 203. Hakeem S. Jeffries.
 204. Joaquin Castro.
 205. Glenn Ivey.
 206. Josh Gottheimer.
 207. Bill Foster.
 208. Sharice Davids.
 209. Sean Casten.
 210. Marie Gluesenkamp Perez.
 211. Abigail Davis Spanberger.
 212. Yadira Caraveo.
 213. Jeff Jackson.
 214. John P. Sarbanes.
 215. Vern Buchanan.
 216. Chris Pappas.
 217. Frank Pallone.
 218. Patrick Ryan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4177. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures [DOE-HQ-2023-0063] (RIN: 1990-AA48) received May 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4178. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 24-003 Certification of Proposed

Issuance of an Export License Pursuant to Sec 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4179. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Risk Management and Financial Assurance for OCS Lease and Grant Obligations [Docket No.: BOEM-2023-0027] (RIN: 1010-AE14) received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4180. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 57 [Docket No.: 180110022-8383-02] (RIN: 0648-BH52) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4181. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Adjustment of Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Yellowtail Flounder Catch Limits [Docket No.: 180123063-8063-01] (RIN: 0648-XF987) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4182. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northern Gulf of Maine Measures in Framework Adjustment 29 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan [Docket No.: 180110025-8285-02] (RIN: 0648-BH51) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4183. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to Framework Adjustment 57 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2018 [Docket No.: 180921861-8861-01] (RIN: 0648-XG503) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4184. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Approval of New Gear Under Small-Mesh Fisheries Accountability Measures [Docket No.: 200225-0063] (RIN: 0648-BF57) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4185. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Skate Complex; Framework Adjustment 4 [Docket

No.: 170710645-8098-02] (RIN: 0648-BH03) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4186. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; 2018-2020 Fishing Quotas [Docket No.: 170818784-8080-02] (RIN: 0648-XF641) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4187. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 180320301-8551-02] (RIN: 0648-XG121) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4188. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Implementation of a Federal Limited Entry Drift Gillnet Permit [Docket No.: 170817773-8213-02] (RIN: 0648-BG81) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-4189. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31540; Amdt. No.: 4108] received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4190. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31539; Amdt. No.: 4107] received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4191. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Lewisburg, WV [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2275; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AEA-22] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4192. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Wallops Island, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2204; Airspace Docket No.: 23-AEA-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4193. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously

Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0026; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00776-T; Amendment 39-22710; AD 2024-06-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4194. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0993; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00178-E; Amendment 39-22725; AD 2024-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4195. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1878; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-01582-E; Amendment 39-22711; AD 2024-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4196. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-1818; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00582-T; Amendment 39-22699; AD 2024-05-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4197. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2135; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00509-T; Amendment 39-22701; AD 2024-05-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4198. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2245; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00973-R; Amendment 39-22698; AD 2024-05-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4199. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2244; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00972-R; Amendment 39-22697; AD 2024-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4200. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0991; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00051-A; Amendment 39-22724; AD 2024-07-

03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4201. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines, and Various Restricted Category Rotorcraft [Docket No.: FAA-2024-0774; Project Identifier AD-2024-00197-E;R; Amendment 39-22723; AD 2024-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANGWORTHY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1227. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8369) to provide for the expeditious delivery of defense articles and defense services for Israel and other matters; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7530) to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7343) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8146) to require a report by the Attorney General on the impact the border crisis is having on law enforcement at the Federal, State, local, and Tribal level; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7581) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 354) to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1213) a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1210) condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result (Rept. 118-511). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 8401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for a portion of employer social security taxes paid with respect to service charges paid by the employer to an employee in the form of wages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 8402. A bill to provide for accurate energy appraisals in connection with residen-

tial mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. MCBATH, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 8403. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Benton MacKaye Trail as a national scenic trail; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 8404. A bill to amend Title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a Radiation Oncology Case Rate Value Based Payment Program exempt from budget neutrality adjustment requirements, and to amend section 1128A of title XI of the Social Security Act to create a new statutory exception for the provision of free or discounted transportation for radiation oncology patients to receive radiation therapy services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself, Ms. TLAB, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JAMES, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 8405. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 McCamly Street South in Battle Creek, Michigan, as the "Sojourner Truth Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 8406. A bill to add Ireland to the E3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGAZINER (for himself, Mr. MOLINARO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 8407. A bill to provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 8408. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 290 NW Peacock Boulevard in Port St. Lucie, Florida, as the "Trooper Zachary Fink Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. NICKEL:

H.R. 8409. A bill to assist parents in locating and utilizing child care that meets individual family needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. LUNA, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. BURLISON):

H.R. 8410. A bill to prohibit judges from issuing gag orders in certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CARL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MAST, Mr. PALMER, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. STRONG):

H.R. 8411. A bill to establish prohibitions with respect to vessels loaded or previously held at ports, harbors, or marine terminals in certain Western Hemisphere countries and with respect to which land owned, held, or controlled directly or indirectly by United States persons that is necessary to access the ports, harbors, marine terminals, or relevant port infrastructure has been nationalized, forcibly limited, or expropriated by the governments of such countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 8412. A bill to modernize clinical trials and remove barriers for participation in clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. BACON, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 8413. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land at Swanson Reservoir and Hugh Butler Reservoir in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 8414. A bill to support efforts of the governments of Western Hemisphere countries to increase the diversity of their upstream supply chains and downstream supply chains; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 8415. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services to evaluate the cybersecurity practices and protocols of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 8416. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to increase the rate of duty on unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8417. A bill to require congressional notice of the cancellation or termination of contracts by the Department of Defense involving certain numbers of employees of contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. RUTHER-

FORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BANKS, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. HILL, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.J. Res. 140. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2020-02"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BANKS, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. HILL, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.J. Res. 141. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption 84-24"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BANKS, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. HILL, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.J. Res. 142. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Retirement Security Rule: Definition of an Investment Advice Fiduciary"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BANKS, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. HILL, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.J. Res. 143. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemptions 75-1, 77-4, 80-83, 83-1, and 86-128"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. MENG, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERRA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 1228. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month

as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1229. A resolution supporting the designation of May 15, 2024, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the increasing number of fraudulent scams targeted at seniors in the United States, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent those scams from happening, and to improve protections from those scams for seniors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NICKEL (for himself, Ms. WILD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina):

H. Res. 1230. A resolution recognizing the hundreds of thousands of lives lost during Sri Lanka's almost 30-year armed conflict, which ended 15 years ago on May 18, 2009, and ensuring nonrecurrence of past violence, including the Tamil Genocide, by supporting the right to self-determination of Eelam Tamil people and their call for an independence referendum for a lasting peaceful resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BUSH, and Mr. CARSON):

H. Res. 1231. A resolution recognizing the Nakba and Palestinian refugees' rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 8401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Taxation

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 8402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 8403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

Natural Resources

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 8404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Creates a Radiation Oncology Case Rate Value Based Payment Program exempt from budget neutrality adjustment requirements, and to amend section 1128A of title XI of the Social Security Act to create a new statutory exception for the provision of free or

discounted transportation for radiation oncology patients to receive radiation therapy services.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 8405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Post office renaming.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 8406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To add Ireland to the E3 nonimmigrant visa program.

By Mr. MAGAZINER:

H.R. 8407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for the discharge of parent borrower liability if a student on whose behalf a parent has received certain student loans becomes disabled.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 8408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 7

The single subject of this legislation is:

Would rename a Post Office located in St. Lucie County, Florida, as the "Trooper Zachary Fink Post Office Building."

By Mr. NICKEL:

H.R. 8409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Child care

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 8410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit judges from issuing gag orders in certain circumstances.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 8411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishes prohibitions with respect to vessels loaded or previously held at ports, harbors, or marine terminals and with respect to which land owned, held, or controlled directly or indirectly by United States persons that is necessary to access the ports or relevant port infrastructure has been nationalized, forcibly limited, or expropriated by the governments of such countries.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To remove barriers to participation in clinical trials

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 8413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill would begin transfer of the Bureau of Reclamation Swanson Reservoir land to Hitchcock county and the Bureau of Reclamation Red Willow Reservoir land to Frontier County.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 8414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Expanding DFC investment authorities.

By Mrs. STEEL:

H.R. 8415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health Care

By Mrs. STEFANIK:

H.R. 8416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To implement incrementally increasing tariffs on PRC-manufactured drones and authorize a grant program.

By Mr. VASQUEZ:

H.R. 8417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of the Congress.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Defense Personnel

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.J. Res. 140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2020-02" (89 Fed. Reg. 32260 (April 25, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.J. Res. 141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disapproves of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption 84-24" (89 Fed. Reg. 32302 (April 25, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.J. Res. 142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disapprove of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to 'Retirement Security Rule:Definition of an Investment Advice Fiduciary' (89 Fed.Reg. 32122 (April 25, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.J. Res. 143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Amendment to Prohibited Transaction Exemption 75-1, 77-4, 80-83, 83-1, and 86-128" (89 Fed. Reg. 32346 (April 25, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 16: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BUSH, and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 79: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 130: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 234: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 431: Mr. LUTTRELL.

H.R. 537: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 544: Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 549: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 594: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 595: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 648: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 674: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 681: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 694: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 743: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER and Mr. MCCORMICK.

H.R. 779: Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 798: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 830: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 866: Ms. PORTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 868: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1002: Ms. PORTER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1015: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 1088: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FROST, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1100: Ms. BOEBERT.

H.R. 1118: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1200: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 1203: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 1321: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1415: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1425: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 1458: Ms. VAN DUYN.

H.R. 1572: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1582: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1691: Ms. MALOY.

H.R. 1831: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2537: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2584: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.

H.R. 2620: Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 2630: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2672: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2696: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 2719: Mr. LAWLER.

H.R. 2742: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.

H.R. 2748: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 2808: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2891: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H.R. 3012: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3170: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3176: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3184: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 3240: Mr. WITTMAN and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 3246: Mr. BERA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3432: Ms. TLAB.

H.R. 3548: Mr. AMO.

H.R. 3601: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 3619: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3620: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3662: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3725: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 3781: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 3842: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3887: Mr. DUNCAN and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 3909: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3916: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

- H.R. 4052: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 4121: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 4219: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 4277: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 4302: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4303: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 4335: Ms. STEFANIK and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 4384: Mr. KILEY and Ms. PEREZ.
H.R. 4519: Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 4541: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 4721: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 4769: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4794: Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 4993: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 5040: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5084: Mr. LUTTRELL.
H.R. 5247: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5266: Ms. PEREZ.
H.R. 5419: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 5455: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 5488: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 5526: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 5531: Mrs. LUNA and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 5547: Mr. CAREY and Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 5555: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 5568: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 5580: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5631: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 5840: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 5851: Ms. JACOBS.
H.R. 5909: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 5989: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 6020: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 6105: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 6171: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 6186: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 6201: Mr. BANKS and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 6319: Ms. MALOY.
H.R. 6348: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 6377: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 6451: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 6452: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 6515: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 6538: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6545: Mr. BENTZ.
H.R. 6613: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 6672: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 6734: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 6832: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 6848: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 6860: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 6951: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. MCCLIN-TOCK.
H.R. 6961: Mrs. FOUSHEE and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 7039: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 7056: Mrs. FOUSHEE.
H.R. 7131: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 7145: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 7198: Mr. VALADAO and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 7218: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 7291: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 7300: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 7384: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 7438: Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 7478: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 7479: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 7480: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 7536: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 7563: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 7613: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7618: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 7629: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 7739: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 7755: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 7770: Mr. WALTZ and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 7833: Ms. BOEBERT.
H.R. 7849: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 7850: Mrs. PELTOLA.
H.R. 7866: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 7911: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 7921: Mr. MANN and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 7954: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 7959: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. FRY, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 8001: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 8005: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 8012: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 8046: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 8049: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 8051: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 8061: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MRVAN, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 8083: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 8122: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 8144: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 8152: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 8164: Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 8195: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 8202: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 8234: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 8242: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DE REMER.
H.R. 8273: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 8298: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 8315: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 8337: Mr. FITZGERALD.
H.R. 8339: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 8340: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 8341: Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 8342: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 8343: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 8350: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 8358: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 8361: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 8362: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 8368: Mr. CASE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 8369: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 8371: Mr. RESCHENTHALER and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 8372: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. BERGMAN, and Ms. MALOY.
H.R. 8373: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 8375: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 8377: Mr. VARGAS.
H.J. Res. 82: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. STEVENS.
H.J. Res. 134: Ms. TENNEY.
H.J. Res. 136: Mr. VALADAO.
H.J. Res. 139: Mr. MANN, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. ALFORD.
H. Con. Res. 106: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 265: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H. Res. 345: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 353: Mr. LAWLER.
H. Res. 881: Ms. TLAIB.
H. Res. 1019: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 1037: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
H. Res. 1121: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H. Res. 1131: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Ms. STEVENS.
H. Res. 1179: Mrs. LESKO.
H. Res. 1186: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
H. Res. 1188: Mr. DONALDS.
H. Res. 1198: Ms. BUDZINSKI and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 1206: Mr. KILMER and Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 1210: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 1226: Mr. FINSTAD.