

contributed to a crime wave that is plaguing our cities.

Of course, this bill makes sense. It should be a crime to threaten the President or First Family. No one disagrees with that. But this body needs to get its priorities straight. Where is the legislation to address the crisis at the border, or address the crime wave, or to do anything meaningful about inflation or the price at the pump?

The bill is fine, but I hope that House Democrats will spend some time addressing the real issues that face the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the author of this legislation.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the 21st Century President Act, a bipartisan bill that I am glad to have authored and introduced.

Federal law hasn't caught up to where progress in this country is, specifically when it comes to who a future President can be.

This bill would change Federal law that refers to a President's spouse. Sections that currently refer to a President's "wife" or "widow" would be changed to "spouse" in recognition of the fact that, in the 21st century, the President could either be a woman or a person from the LGBTQ community.

Without this change to the U.S. Code, for example, the law that makes it a crime to threaten, kill, kidnap, or inflict bodily harm upon the President or the President's family would fail to include a future female or gay President and their potential spouse.

This change is long overdue. Someday, there could be a President KAMALA HARRIS, or ELIZABETH WARREN, or AMY KLOBUCHAR, or TAMMY BALDWIN, or Pete Buttigieg, or a President Nikki Haley, or Kristi Noem, or LIZ CHENEY.

The words in law matter. It is critically important that Federal law recognizes that we could one day have a President who is not a man, or even a straight man, and that they and their families deserve equal protection under the law.

I am glad that this bill passed the House by voice vote last Congress and that it has now been voted out of the Judiciary Committee twice on a voice vote.

I personally thank Chairman NADLER and the Judiciary Committee for their support of this important bipartisan bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to, once again, support the 21st Century President Act.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, H.R. 3285, the 21st Century President Act, does indeed take our criminal code into the 21st century by removing gender terms and assumptions about who can be President from our criminal code.

It passed, as I said, on a voice vote last Congress. I ask my colleagues to again stand with me in supporting this legislation.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3285, the "21st Century President Act"—an insightful, common-sense measure, of which I am an original cosponsor.

In considering this bill, I think back to 1970 when Representative Shirley Chisolm, speaking on the need to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, asked: "Why is it acceptable for women to be secretaries, librarians, and teachers, but totally unacceptable for them to be managers, administrators, doctors, lawyers, and Members of Congress?" At that time, it was almost unthinkable that a woman could be elected President of the United States.

Although we have yet to ratify the ERA, our country has made great strides in the struggle for gender equality since then—from the groundbreaking presidential primary campaign of Representative Chisolm in 1972; to the first-of-its-kind vice presidential nomination of Geraldine Ferraro; to the 18 million cracks in the glass ceiling made by Hillary Clinton; and the historic election of President Joe Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris, which began with a field that included six women and one member of the LGBTQ community.

Given the diversity of candidates for the presidency in recent years and the more inclusive times in which we live, our laws should evolve to reflect this societal progress.

That is why H.R. 3285 amends section 879 of title 18 to do away with the assumption that the president is male and his spouse female by removing gendered terms such as "wife" or "widow."

I hope we can all agree that "immediate family" means much more today than the 1982 law provides and that the spouse of our President should be protected regardless of gender.

Indeed, we have come very far in the pursuit of gender equality since this statute was enacted. Yet H.R. 3285 makes clear there is still much work to be done.

As we approach the 50th anniversary of the enactment of Title IX, women's rights are once again under threat and the push for genuine gender equality has been renewed.

Each of us must remain vigilant and ensure that equality of rights under the law are neither denied nor abridged by the United States or by any state on account of gender in any manner.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative MARK POCAN, for his efforts to bring us into the 21st century and for recognizing the importance of ensuring the safety and security of those who may come from the wide, vast diversity of America to serve as President.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill and hope we can pass it by voice vote as we did in the 116th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3285.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ACTIVE SHOOTER ALERT ACT OF 2022

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6538) to create an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6538

*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 "Active Shooter Alert Act of 2022".*

### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

*In this Act:*

(1) **ACTIVE SHOOTER.**—The term "active shooter" means an individual who is engaged in killing or attempting to kill persons with a firearm in a populated area and who is determined to pose an active, imminent threat to people in that populated area.

(2) **ADMINISTRATOR OF FEMA.**—The term "Administrator of FEMA" means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(3) **CHAIRMAN OF THE FCC.**—The term "Chairman of the FCC" means the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

(4) **COORDINATOR.**—The term "Coordinator" means the Active Shooter Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 3(a).

(5) **NETWORK.**—The term "Network" means the Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, an interconnected system of Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments that is organized to provide information to the public, within geographically relevant areas, on active shooter situations.

(6) **POPULATED AREA.**—The term "populated area" means a location where one or more persons other than the active shooter are present.

(7) **STATE.**—The term "State" means any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands of the United States, and any other territory of the United States.

### SEC. 3. NATIONAL COORDINATION OF ACTIVE SHOOTER ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

(a) **COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—The Attorney General shall assign an officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Active Shooter Alert Communications Network regarding an emergency involving an active shooter. The officer so designated shall be known as the Active Shooter Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice.

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Coordinator shall—

(1) encourage Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies to establish procedures to respond to an active shooter, including active shooter procedures relating to interstate or interjurisdictional travel (including airports and border crossing areas and checkpoints), and focus on governments that have not yet established such procedures; and

(2) work with State, Tribal, and local governments to encourage appropriate regional and interjurisdictional coordination of various elements of the Network.

(c) **GOALS.**—The Coordinator shall encourage the adoption of best practices established under section 4(a) in State, Tribal, and local governments for—

(1) the development of policies and procedures to guide the use of mass alert systems, changeable message signs, or other information systems

to notify local residents, motorists, travelers, and individuals in the vicinity of an active shooter;

(2) the development of guidance or policies on the content and format of alert messages to be conveyed on mass alert systems, changeable message signs, or other information systems relating to an active shooter;

(3) the coordination of State, Tribal, and local Active Shooter Alert communications plans within a region for the use of mass alert systems relating to an active shooter;

(4) the planning and designing of mass alert systems for multilingual communication with local residents, motorists, travelers, and individuals in the vicinity of an active shooter, which system may include the capability for issuing wide area alerts to local residents, motorists, travelers, and individuals in the vicinity of an active shooter;

(5) the planning of systems and protocols to facilitate the efficient issuance of active shooter alerts and other key information to local residents, motorists, travelers, and individuals in the vicinity of an active shooter during times of day outside of normal business hours;

(6) the provision of training and guidance to transportation authorities to facilitate the appropriate use of mass alert systems and other information systems for the notification of local residents, motorists, travelers, and individuals in the vicinity of an active shooter; and

(7) the development of appropriate mass alert systems to ensure that alerts sent to individuals in the immediate vicinity of an active shooter do not alert the active shooter to the location of individuals sheltering in place near the active shooter.

(d) **INTEGRATED PUBLIC ALERT AND WARNING SYSTEM.**—In carrying out duties under subsection (b), the Coordinator shall notify and coordinate with the Administrator of FEMA, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Chairman of the FCC on using the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System to issue alerts for the Network.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter until such time as each of the State, Tribal, and local governments have adopted an active shooter alert protocol, the Coordinator, in consultation with the Administrator of FEMA, Secretary of Transportation, and the Chairman of the FCC, shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Active Shooter Alert communications plan of each State, Tribal, and local government within each region that has implemented such a plan.

**SEC. 4. STANDARDS FOR ISSUANCE AND DISSEMINATION OF ALERTS THROUGH ACTIVE SHOOTER ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Coordinator, using the recommendations of the Advisory Panel established under subsection (b) and in coordination with the Administrator of FEMA, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the FCC, local broadcasters, and Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, shall establish best practices for—

(A) the issuance of alerts through the Network;

(B) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the Network; and

(C) the achievement of the goals described in section 3(c).

(2) **UPDATING BEST PRACTICES.**—The Coordinator shall review the best practices established under paragraph (1) no less frequently than every 5 years to ensure the best practices are consistent with updated data and recommendations on active shooter situations and technological advancements in the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System or other technologies. The Coordinator shall convene the Advisory

Panel as necessary to provide updated recommendations if the best practices are to be updated.

(b) **ADVISORY PANEL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Coordinator shall establish an Advisory Panel to make recommendations with respect to the establishment of best practices under subsection (a).

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Panel shall be comprised of at least 9 members, including—

(A) at least 5 law enforcement officers, including at least one nonsupervisory law enforcement officer, who have responded to active shooter incidents and who represent rural, suburban, and urban communities;

(B) at least 1 public safety expert who is not a law enforcement officer and who has responded to an active shooter incident;

(C) at least 1 emergency response official who is not a law enforcement officer;

(D) at least 1 city planning expert; and

(E) at least 1 mental and behavioral health expert.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Advisory Panel shall submit to Coordinator recommendations with respect to the establishment of best practices under subsection (a).

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The best practices established under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be adoptable on a voluntary basis only; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator, in consultation with State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies), provide that—

(i) appropriate information relating to an active shooter response is disseminated to the appropriate law enforcement, public health, communications, and other public officials; and

(ii) the dissemination of an alert through the Network be limited to the geographic areas most likely to be affected by, or able to respond to, an active shooter situation.

(2) **NO INTERFERENCE.**—In establishing best practices under subsection (a), the Coordinator may not interfere with systems of voluntary coordination between local broadcasters and State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies for improving and implementing the Network.

**SEC. 5. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON STATE RESPONSES TO ACTIVE SHOOTER SITUATIONS REQUIRING THE ISSUANCE OF PUBLIC ALERTS AND WARNINGS.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on State and local responses to active shooters and situations requiring the issuance of a public alert or warning. Such study shall address each of the following:

(1) Differences between the definitions of the term “active shooter” used by different States.

(2) The amount of time it takes and the process in each State to receive approval from the State alerting officials after a local law enforcement agency requests the issuance of a public alert or warning, such as an AMBER Alert, a Blue Alert, or an Ashanti alert.

(3) A comparison of the timing and effectiveness of the issuance of public alerts and warnings by State, Tribal, and local alerting officials.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

**SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General to carry out this Act \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2023.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Amounts appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

**SEC. 7. LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed to provide that a participating agency, or an officer, employee, or agent thereof, shall be liable for any act or omission pertaining to the Network.

(b) **STATE OR OTHER FEDERAL LAW.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the application of any State or other Federal law providing for liability for any act or omission pertaining to the Network.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6538.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill, H.R. 6538, the Active Shooter Alert Act, bipartisan legislation which I introduced with Congressman UPTON and 16 other original Republican and Democratic cosponsors to help keep our communities safer in the event of an active shooter.

Between 2000 and 2020, there were close to 400 active shooter events, including 40 active shooter incidents in 2020 and 61 such incidents in 2021 alone.

In 2016, in Congressman UPTON's backyard, we saw a Michigan Uber driver go on a shooting rampage and then continue picking up passengers.

In 2019, a shooter drove around a community in Texas, killing 7 and wounding 25 people.

In 2021, a shooter traveled 30 miles, murdering eight people at various Atlanta-area spas.

Just this past April, a shooter attacked a subway station full of people in Brooklyn and was then on the run for 24 hours before police finally detained him.

Such active shooters have become ubiquitous, so frequent that some of these horrific events barely make headlines. This is not normal, and we cannot let it become normalized. We cannot become numb to these events or settle for the status quo. We need to act now to make our communities safer, and that includes providing law enforcement with every tool they need to do so.

Law enforcement has asked for ways to better alert their communities when active shooter incidents arise. This legislation answers that call.

The Active Shooter Alert Act creates an AMBER Alert-like program for active shooter events. This bill will provide law enforcement with cutting-edge technology to send notifications

to our smartphones and let communities know if there is an active shooter in a certain area so they know to stay away.

The bill also instructs the Department of Justice to consult with police safety experts, including officers who have responded to these incidents, to develop best practices and protocols for sending out these alerts. This will allow law enforcement to learn from each other as they adapt this alert system to the needs of the communities, if they so choose.

Developing this kind of technology and infrastructure, and identifying best practices, would be a massive undertaking for many local police departments. Some communities simply don't have the resources to do it on their own. However, we already have these resources at the Federal level.

This legislation simply gives every law enforcement agency across the country the option to access the Federal alert system so they can send alerts in their area.

Nothing in this bill is mandatory for law enforcement agencies to adopt, but it will provide access to an important tool for law enforcement departments across the country, regardless of their size or location.

It is, sadly, becoming more and more necessary to have these protocols in place. As we have seen time and time again, when there is an active shooter situation, law enforcement does all they can to keep people in the surrounding area safe, including going door to door to either evacuate or tell people to shelter in place. But that takes time, time that could cost lives.

More than anyone, law enforcement understands the strain an active shooter puts on a community in an ongoing crisis. In these stressful, life-or-death situations, law enforcement is too often, in many cases, relying on social media to communicate with the surrounding community so that no one accidentally walks into the line of fire, including other members of law enforcement.

Law enforcement deserves the best tools available, certainly better than Twitter, to communicate with their communities.

Now, if you look at the after-action reports in so many of these active shooter incidents, they all recognize that it would have been so helpful to have a way to quickly and safely communicate with other members of law enforcement or the local community about an active shooter.

I am proud that this bill has the endorsement of law enforcement organizations across the country at the national, State, and local levels and that it is a resoundingly bipartisan effort.

I thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have supported this commonsense measure and Mr. UPON for leading this effort with me. I encourage a "yes" vote.

Just to be clear, this is legislation endorsed by the National Sheriffs' As-

sociation, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Police Foundation, the National Association of Police Organizations, Major Cities Chiefs Association, National District Attorneys Association, and many other local law enforcement agencies.

The men and women who are protecting our communities are saying they need this. It is bipartisan. I urge everyone to vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Active Shooter Alert Act is unnecessary. It gives more authority to the Biden Justice Department, the most political Justice Department in history.

States already utilize emergency alert systems to warn the public about natural and human-made disasters, extreme weather events, active shooter situations, and other emergencies. Federal, State, and local officials already use the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System to send emergency alerts to mobile devices and to alert media platforms.

According to a 2020 report from the Government Accountability Office, every State has at least one alerting authority, and there are more than 1,400 alerting authorities across the country.

If the States are already using an alerting system to notify the public about imminent threats, what is this bill really doing? What is this bill really about? This bill is creating a new Federal job at the Biden DOJ to encourage State and local governments to issue public alerts any time a firearm is used to threaten anyone anywhere.

Don't take my word for it. During the markup, Congressman JONES admitted that:

This bill would be most effective at reminding us that the threat of gun violence exists all around us, but it does little to actually protect us from it.

That is right. This bill is about Democrat fear-mongering that guns are ever-present threats, and we cannot be safe until Big Government rounds up every last gun.

In fact, Congressman JONES went further and called on the committee to consider another bill that would ban assault weapons. The Democrat chair of the committee followed up by voicing his support for that very concept.

No wonder the Democrats want to push forward a bill that will create a reminder that "the threat of gun violence exists all around us." They want to create a culture of fear so they can achieve their ultimate goal, which is getting rid of the Second Amendment.

□ 1530

If they really wanted to improve emergency alerts for active shooters, we would be moving a bill to improve the IPAWS wireless emergency alerts that are sent to mobile devices.

In a recent report, GAO stated that local alerting officials had expressed concerns about the inability to target WEA alerts with accuracy, which made local officials reluctant to even use the system at all.

They have got a system out there. Let's improve the system and alert people to emergencies, not have legislation that is about ultimately undermining the Second Amendment.

We could have had hearings. We could have received expert testimony. We could have been able to fully vet this initiative. This legislation is simply another failed attempt by Democrats to "do something" about the surge in violence and crime across the country.

If we need to do something, we should start by supporting law enforcement and the rule of law instead of demonizing our police and actively encouraging illegal entry into this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), an important member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Like many of you, I am struggling as we see day after day, night after night, more lives lost to gun violence in America.

On Sunday, a 15-year-old boy was killed and three other people shot in a mass shooting 15 minutes from where we stand right now.

On Monday, just after midnight, a 21-year-old college student was killed in a hail of gunfire that also wounded eight others in Harlem.

Last week, in the Judiciary Committee, I talked about the three young men who were killed and 11 wounded in the single biggest shooting in Philadelphia in 7 years. Are we safe anywhere in this country anymore?

Many of us are determined to fight for radical change to combat a dangerous obsession with guns and gun violence.

In the Judiciary Committee, we voted for extreme risk protection orders. Republicans in that committee voted "no." We voted to raise the age for purchase of semiautomatics to 21. Republicans said "no." We voted to safely store guns. Republicans said "no." We voted to get rid of ghost guns. Republicans said "no." We voted for background checks. Republicans said "no."

Now, today, we are trying to pass text alerts—alerts—for active shooters. I am thankful that this small measure has some bipartisan support.

Yet, some Republicans in Congress support guns so much that they will find a way to say "no" and hide behind the Second Amendment.

I am struggling, but determined, inspired by the overwhelming number of

Americans who are demanding action: Republicans, Democrats, gun owners, non-gun owners, independents. Demand action, not excuses.

This is a sad, yet important step. I thank the chairman for bringing it forward. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to wake up. Our children's lives are at stake every day.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I would point out, we are not trying to hide behind the Second Amendment—we are trying to defend it. We are defending it.

It is an important part of our Bill of Rights, an important part of our Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), no better defender of the Second Amendment, and the co-chair of the Second Amendment Caucus.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member JIM JORDAN for yielding the time.

You know, I find it interesting that all across the country, Democrats are moving to defund the police. Here, today in Congress, we have a bill called the Active Shooter Alert Act of 2022.

Well, if they defund the police, a more appropriate title for this bill would be the you are on your own act of 2022. Yes, that is right. We think you are in danger, but nobody is coming to help you because we have defunded the police.

But what does this bill really do? You know, if it were anything other than an attempt to demonize guns, to panic people, it would cover things like stabbing, car violence. How come we never hear about car violence? It would cover all violence, but they have chosen to single out the Second Amendment and firearms.

The technology already exists to do this, and the States that want to do it have already done it, and the campuses across the country that want to do it have implemented this a decade ago.

So, why are we doing this at the Federal level? What is the purpose to take what would have been good ideas at the State level, bring them up here, launder them, and then go tell the States how they have to do it, even though they are already doing it in many cases?

What good does a one-size-fits-all bill do when you dictate from D.C.?

You know, rural Kentucky is not like urban Chicago. If you hear a gun go off in rural Kentucky, your first instinct is not to panic.

Now, if your phone comes on and tells you that you need to panic, you might be inclined to do that. But when you hear a gun go off in Kentucky, you assume somebody is hunting. You assume they are target practicing. They are doing something that is lawful.

In maybe 1 out of 10,000 cases that it is not, it is just somebody poaching a deer, probably, but it ain't nothing to panic about. That is what they want you to do.

You know, it is different when you hear a gun in Kentucky than when you

hear one in downtown Chicago, which gets me to the point: Can you turn this system off in Chicago?

Is anybody going to be able to sleep in a Democrat-controlled city where crime is rampant, where they are moving to defund the police? How will you get to bed?

Every few hours, there is violence in Chicago, or pick your favorite big city run by a big, liberal Democrat where they have the strongest gun bans in the country. They have more violence than anywhere else.

So can you turn it off? That would be my first question for those poor folks in Chicago that have to deal with the sort of public policy that Democrats have advanced.

Now, one of the questions that came up in our committee that was never answered: Is this going to tell you after the fact, after the shooting has happened, or will it alert you to one that they think is about to happen?

We asked, and I asked the bill's sponsor multiple times: Does it do that, or does it just tell you after something has already happened? He didn't know. He wouldn't answer. I doubt he will give us a straight answer here today, if he chooses to answer.

So what good is it if it is going to tell you after it has already happened?

So, you know, here is what you have to wonder. Every time there is a bill in Congress, it has a great name. At first, it sounds like a great idea. Then when you dig into it, well, somebody has already done it, and it probably is already done at the State level.

So, for instance, there are a couple other bills that they passed a couple weeks ago that are already being done. They passed a bill that would ban gun trafficking. Well, the problem is, that is already banned.

So what you have to do is dig down and say: Why are they passing another bill? What does this bill do that the one that exists doesn't already do?

Well, we found out it would prosecute domestic violence victims if they acquire a firearm for their protection from a neighbor. Well, that doesn't sound like a good idea to me, but the name of the bill sounded pretty good until you dug down into it.

The same thing for red flag laws. There is a version of involuntary commitment in all 50 States that already exists, but the difference is there is due process. So why are they doing a shooter alert bill here, an active shooter alert bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. So why are they passing a law to do something that is already being done? Well, they want to take Federal control, and then what are they going to do with that Federal control? They want to panic and scare the general public with their phones.

Everybody has got one today. You won't be able to turn it off.

Oh, no. Be afraid of a gun. Be afraid of a gun. Here is another alert. Be afraid of a gun.

That is so they can advance their other agenda, their real agenda, which is to ban all guns and to effectively repeal the Second Amendment.

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

I will make a couple of points quickly. This legislation has nothing to do with limitations on the Second Amendment. It has nothing to do with red flag laws. It has nothing to do with this claim of defunding the police.

I have lots of material for the RECORD that shows police departments have been cut in other communities led by Republican mayors and Republican Governors. Let's not have that debate. This is about a simple provision that will save lives.

With all due respect to my colleagues who claim they understand what this legislation is about, I trust the judgment of the men and women who are actually going into active shooter situations. I don't think there is a single Member who has spoken who has been responsible for responding to an active shooting incident. I think it is time we respect the men and women who actually do that every day.

The men and women of law enforcement are pleading for this legislation to help keep them safe, as well as the communities they serve. I won't be so presumptuous, Madam Speaker, to think I have better judgment on that question than they do. That is why they have all endorsed this bill.

The third thing I will say: Mr. MASSIE said, Madam Speaker, that this question wasn't answered. I will answer it again, the same way I answered it in committee.

The standards are established by law enforcement. Active shooter alerts already exist in some States and in some local communities. There are a set of protocols.

Obviously, they don't wait until the shooting has concluded to notify people. They use common sense, their own standards about when they see a danger; someone with a gun that is expressing some intention to use it or whatever standard they consider appropriate as members of law enforcement to alert the community. This is common sense.

The problem is, there are a lot of small departments that don't have the ability to access this system or to understand best practices or to see the research about how it is used most effectively. This would allow them to have access to that.

Not a single jurisdiction that doesn't want to use it is required to. There is no Federal Government power here. It is making it available. If you decide as a local law enforcement agency or State you don't want to use it, you don't have to, but it is making it available. This will save lives.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, such irony. Democrats lecturing Republicans on law enforcement and respect for law enforcement. This from the party who spent an entire summer talking about defunding the police, who had elected officials in this body, Democrats in this body, raise money to bail out the rioters and looters who they called peaceful protesters who were attacking police, and now he is going to lecture Republicans on respect for law enforcement. I mean, you can't make it up. This is how the Democrats operate today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding time.

You know, a few years ago in this building, the U.S. Capitol, we had an active shooter. I was there. Tragically, he killed two brave Capitol Police officers as the shooter tried to hunt down our Republican whip, Tom DeLay.

We were in session. The shooter was just down the stairs. During that rampage, the House adjourned for the end of the week. Like every week, just like last week, a bunch of us bounded down those steps, got in our cars, raced to the airport to get home to our districts. We had no clue what was going on down the hall in the Capitol.

When I got to DCA, I was shocked to see how close the shooter got to, really, all of us, particularly if he had just stood at the bottom of the stairs and just sprayed us as we were coming down.

We had no clue what was going on. We also had no information from our phones or from our beepers in terms of what was going on.

Well, times have changed. We have that capability today. Every major law enforcement organization supports this bill. This helps an active shooter alert system so that potential victims can be alerted when there is an active shooter.

I would just note in the last 2 hours, all of us here got four messages from the Capitol Police saying that there was a suspicious package outside of the Cannon House Office Building.

Literally, Independence Avenue was shut down, closed to all traffic because of the alerts that we were able to get. Shouldn't our constituents enjoy the same technology that we have here in our own Congress?

You know, Madam Speaker, this simple bill will support law enforcement and keep our communities safe, period.

In 2016, in Kalamazoo, in my district, an Uber driver spent nearly 5 hours one night picking up riders, killing them, picking up another rider, killing them, until he was finally apprehended.

When that rampage was over, more than six people died. Another two were injured. There was no system like this that could inform the citizens in downtown Kalamazoo about what was going on.

In after-action reports from mass shootings and others around the country since Columbine in 1999, they have all recommended a system like this, to create an Active Shooter Alert Act. This bill was the top request from tens of thousands of police officers who attended Police Week just a couple of weeks ago.

This bill has nothing to do with the Second Amendment; doesn't take away guns, nor should it. It protects innocent people who might be impacted by an active shooter, whether it be our kids, our loved ones, or our fellow citizens.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his thoughtful words.

I also want to mention that some of my colleagues earlier in the debate said creating this is going to create a fear of shooting. That is what Democrats are really up to, and the 15 or 16 Republicans that are the original co-sponsors of this bill.

Well, I would ask one question: When we created the AMBER Alert to help families find a child who is lost, or the Silver Alert, it didn't create any great fear. It effectively made sure when seniors were lost, they were found. When children were lost, they were found. So that is a specious argument.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I often think it is helpful to think about what Americans must be thinking as they watch debates here on this floor.

In this instance, I am sure that Americans think, as Mr. MASSIE suggested, and as I just have been thinking and was thinking in our markup: Aren't we already doing this? Aren't there alert systems that go out all the time for times when a child has been abducted, an elderly person has gone missing, all sorts of things?

Sure enough, Federal, State, and local officials already use the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, IPAWS, to alert the public to emergency situations. Government officials use the IPAWS Wireless Emergency Alert, the WEA—a lot of acronyms, sure; it is government—to send emergency alerts to mobile devices and use the Emergency Alert System, EAS, to alert media platforms.

According to FEMA, "Imminent threat alerts include natural or human-made disasters, extreme weather, active shooters, and other threatening emergencies that are current or emerging."

So, wait a minute, active shooters are already specifically covered by FEMA under the existing alert system? So, what is going on?

A hint emerged in our committee markup when the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) offered an amendment to broaden the name of the bill, not just to cover active shooters. The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) opposed the amendment—not only opposed it, but he termed Mr. ISSA's proposal offensive. Now, we are getting to it.

The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), who spoke a moment ago, called it gun legislation. An alert system is gun legislation?

It comes down to another messaging opportunity—doesn't it?—the yearning to sensationalize an admittedly awful problem. But I have to say to my fellow Members of the House of Representatives, sensationalizing this problem is not a solution to it.

The examples given by Ms. DEAN on the floor today she herself said reflected her desire for radical change, but all of her examples avoided the topic at hand, this alerting system.

How would a redundant emergency alerting system of national scope have impacted the Juneteenth day shooting on 14th Street here in the District of Columbia or the shooting last week, a gang-related shooting in Philly? How would an alerting system have changed that?

Here is what I would say to the Members on the other side: You are still not grappling with the real issue. The Juneteenth shooting did not occur because the existing public alerting systems were inadequate nor because, in fact, guns are available or even prevalent, as they have always been in the United States since its founding.

If you do not address what has changed, your efforts will only grow government and reduce freedom.

Mr. CICILLINE just said, well, small police departments don't have the resources to access alerting systems or to learn about best practices. Really? I was in the State legislature in North Carolina. I know what resources we made available.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, we would never fail to make available—and it is not beyond the resources of any State in this Union—public alerting systems and to consider such issues as whether or not we wish to activate vigilantes who might respond to such an alert.

This makes no sense. You are not grappling with the issue. For that reason, this is not the answer. It should be defeated.

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

Madam Speaker, I will respond briefly to the last speaker suggesting that somehow this isn't going to solve all the problems of gun violence. No one suggested it is.

This is a simple bill that is introduced to protect law enforcement and members of the community when an active shooter happens. We can continue to fight about how we should reduce gun violence, but when it occurs, this will save lives. It is not intended to be the solution, the big answer to everything. It is intended to save lives.

I will repeat again—with all due respect to my Republican colleagues who think they are experts in policing, who think they know better than law enforcement what they need when they run into danger—it is easy to say that in the comfort of the House Chamber, where you are protected by Capitol Police and you get alerts.

These are men and women who are running into bullets and communities that are threatened. You raised what happened on 14th Street. A young man who works for me received a notice 35 minutes after the scene was cleared through his Ring security system in his building that there was an active shooter. Had there been one in place, he would have been notified and not walked into danger.

You have the National Sheriffs' Association, the FOP, and others saying this will be very helpful. These are people who, admittedly, actually are responsible for keeping communities safe, unlike anyone who just spoke on the Republican side. They say it will help us keep communities safe.

The CEO of the National Sheriffs' Association said: "This alert system will be another excellent tool for law enforcement to do its job."

Bryan Porter from the National District Attorneys Association: "This bipartisan legislation creates a new alert system for law enforcement to alert the public when there are active shooters while also providing resources as our members work to keep our communities safe."

Jeri Williams, president of the Major Chiefs Association: "... which will undoubtedly be a valuable tool and resource for law enforcement agencies."

Bill Johnson, the National Association of Police Organizations: "The Active Shooter Alert Act will assist law enforcement in alerting citizens of an active shooter situation in their vicinity, keeping them away from the incident and maintaining their safety."

Finally, Patrick Yoes, the national president of the Fraternal Order of Police: This bill will help "improve the ways officers and agencies communicate with the public about active threats."

I could read 10 more quotes from people who actually do this work.

The North Carolina Association of Chiefs of Police has also endorsed this bill, which I think should be important to Mr. BISHOP, who just spoke.

Look, these are men and women who do the job every day, and they are saying they need this, that it will be useful. It doesn't solve all the problems, but it works, and the notion that,

"Well, you can just do it. It is redundant," it is just not true.

This bill has in it provisions that will provide for the development of protocols, the sharing of best practices, a law enforcement advisory group, things that will make sure the active shooter alert works even better. It is made available to communities that may not have all those resources to support the implementation of this system.

Can anyone say that every single American doesn't deserve to get this information, and every member of law enforcement doesn't deserve to get this information, so they don't go into a dangerous situation?

I know it is difficult because you somehow have it in your head that Democrats are up to something. FRED UPTON, VICTORIA SPARTZ, PETER MELJER, NANCY MACE, DON BACON, ANDREW GARBARINO, JAY OBERNOLTE, JEFFERSON VAN DREW, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, JOHN CARTER, TOM RICE, MICHAEL MCCAUL, KELLY ARMSTRONG, DAVID MCKINLEY, and JULIA LETLOW are all Republican original cosponsors. Do you think they are up to something, too? They are just trying to keep their communities safe and give law enforcement the tools they need.

We can argue about the underlying cause of crime. I am happy to have that debate. This bill is not about that. It is about protecting people when an active shooter incident happens.

The final thing I would say is, if you look at the after-action reports that are done after active shootings, almost without exception, they all reference that it would have made a real difference if we had a good communication system.

In the situation Mr. UPTON talked about in Kalamazoo, in their after-action report, they said neither the Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety nor the Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Office "had a strong social media presence at the time of the shooting," which "hampered the departments' ability to update the community on the progression of the incident, notify them when the arrest was made, and reassure them that they were indeed safe from further violence."

In the Columbine shooting, in the after-action report, they say: Our schools' greatest vulnerabilities exist because of voids in basic security policies and strategies, such as effective communications and notification systems.

In the Broward County incident at the Hollywood airport in 2017, they write in their after-action report: "Review and budget for improvements to public notification systems, including visual paging, overhead announcements, and mass notification systems" would be helpful. It was noted during the event that airport patrons lost personal items except one, their cellular phones. The ability to reach every cell phone with messages enables law enforcement to provide instant informa-

tion directly to victims. It goes on and on and on.

Again, police are asking for this. The after-action reports underscore the need for it.

Set aside the fact that the lead sponsor or the author is me. There are 15 other Democrats, 15 other Republicans, very bipartisan, and I haven't heard any argument why we shouldn't give law enforcement what was identified as one of their top priorities during National Police Week.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

First, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, this bill is redundant. There are 1,400 alerting authorities across the country that already alert citizens in those communities to an active shooter, so it is redundant.

Second, it does seek to undermine the Second Amendment. Don't take my word for it. Take one of the Democrat supporters of the legislation on the Judiciary Committee. Here is what he said:

This bill would be most effective at reminding us that the threat of gun violence exists all around us, but it does little to actually protect us.

You have to view it in context. Remember, the last 4 weeks, all Democrats have talked about is taking away people's Second Amendment liberties.

We have this huge debate going on in the Senate right now, red flag laws where you have no due process. Someone who doesn't like you comes and says, "We are going to take away so-and-so's firearm," and goes to a judge or law enforcement to take away their firearm. There is a hearing you are not allowed to be at. They take it away, and then you have to go get it back. Your fundamental liberty, taking your property, your rights from you, this is the context with which they bring this legislation.

The third reason, I don't know who in their right mind would want to give the Department of Justice more authority in light of what we have seen from this Department of Justice. Frankly, I don't know why you would give any Democrat-run Department of Justice more authority after what we have seen from the Obama Justice Department and now what we see from the Biden Justice Department.

The Obama Justice Department spied on Presidential campaigns. The Biden Department of Justice is treating moms and dads as terrorists, using domestic terrorism, counterterrorism measures, the PATRIOT Act, against parents, for goodness sakes.

We know that because we have had multiple FBI agents come forward as whistleblowers and tell us about the

over two dozen investigations into parents. One of those parents was investigated simply because they owned a firearm. That is the context and why we have concerns with this legislation.

I hope we vote “no” on this. More importantly, I hope the Senate doesn’t pass this package they are talking about, which would certainly undermine liberties of law-abiding American citizens.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, if I were a classroom teacher right now, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio: Focus. Focus. Pay attention to what we are talking about.

What we are talking about is an active shooter alert. We are not talking about a red flag bill. We are not talking about any effort to undermine the Second Amendment. We are not talking about education policy. We are talking about one thing: Can we help keep people safe?

This is not redundant because while it is being used by 1,400 cities and towns around the country, there are thousands and thousands who have not used it because they can’t access it because they don’t have the resources, the protocols, the best practices. This will allow them.

If we save one life, if because of the active shooter alert we save one child, one police officer, it will have been worth it.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 6538. Give our brave law enforcement men and women who keep our communities safe every tool they need to keep themselves safe and keep the communities they serve safe. Don’t take my word for it; take theirs. They have all endorsed it. They are asking for a “yes.”

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6538, the “Active Shooter Alert Act of 2022.”

In recent weeks, months, and years, we have mourned the loss of life resulting from an ever-increasing number of active shooter incidents where perpetrators committed mass shootings in multiple locations.

Communities in every corner of this country have been subjected to the fear and uncertainty created by active shooters in their midst.

Last year, there were 61 active shooter incidents in the United States. Approximately 27 of those incidents involved an active shooter moving from one location to another.

For instance, 8 people were killed roughly 30 miles apart at three spas in the metro Atlanta area last year. The gunman was later apprehended some 150 miles south of Atlanta.

And we are all still reeling from the gruesome murder of 19 fourth graders and two teachers in Uvalde, Texas that began when the perpetrator shot his grandmother in the home they shared.

He then drove away, crashing his vehicle outside Robb Elementary. He encountered several people before entering the school and

committing unspeakable acts on those helpless children and teachers.

While the actions of these individuals and other active shooters are unacceptable and require Congress to enact measures to put an end to such evil acts, we must also be prepared if these situations occur, and do all we can to help law enforcement save more lives.

Law enforcement’s response to an active shooter is a dynamic situation—oftentimes chaotic—that involves many variables, requires swift, consequential decision-making, and places great strain on law enforcement command staff and their officers on the ground.

Their goal is to save the lives of victims and prevent others from unknowingly entering the area or walking into the line of fire—at all times focusing on containing, neutralizing, and apprehending the shooter.

Centers of higher learning and primary education, businesses, local jurisdictions, and law enforcement agencies have already implemented some systems to alert students, employees, patrons, and community members of the presence of an active shooter, and to help manage the response, and provide updates about the ongoing crisis via text message and/or social media.

Many of these systems face low enrollment and messaging delays that sometimes contribute to confusion around the incident. In the case of social media—insufficient account visibility means fewer people are made aware of an existing threat to their safety.

Recently here in Washington, D.C. a sniper-style attacker set a rifle on a tripod and fired randomly at passersby walking below his window.

D.C. Metro Police used their Twitter account to warn people to avoid the area and shelter in place. But the tweets, or posts, received minimal attention during the actual attack.

An Active Shooter Alert might have saved the life of the woman who unknowingly walked directly into the line of fire of the Buffalo shooter in the Tops parking lot.

Law enforcement needs a reliable method of communication to rapidly notify as many people as possible within the vicinity of an ongoing active shooter incident; provide instructions to avoid the area or shelter in place; and announce when the area has been restored to safety.

H.R. 6538, the Active Shooter Alert Act of 2022, would authorize the Department of Justice to coordinate the creation of an Active Shooter Alert Network, enabling law enforcement to send active shooter alerts within their communities using the same system that issues AMBER Alerts, severe storm and extreme weather events warnings, and other emergency situations.

That system—the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System can send alerts to mobile devices in locally targeted areas down to 1/10th of a mile.

This legislation would ensure that an advisory panel—comprised of law enforcement officers, public safety experts, and emergency response officials experienced in responding to active shooter situations—has input in the development of best practices for issuing alerts effectively.

DOJ by way of an appointed Active Shooter Alert Coordinator would be responsible for establishing the advisory panel; establishing and promoting adoption of the best practices; and

coordinating with FEMA, the Department of Transportation, and the FCC on using the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System to issue alerts for the network and to provide a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the network.

Although this system would be available to law enforcement agencies to use on a voluntary basis, I expect that many agencies would elect to participate based on the numerous endorsements previously mentioned by the Chairman.

I thank ACAL Subcommittee Chairman CICILLINE for his leadership on this lifesaving, bipartisan legislation that I am proud to cosponsor along with Representatives DEUTCH, SPARTZ, UPTON, THOMPSON, MEIJER, and MACE.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6538, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

□ 1600

#### PROMOTING UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN 5G ACT OF 2021

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1934) to direct the Federal Government to provide assistance and technical expertise to enhance the representation and leadership of the United States at international standards-setting bodies that set standards for equipment, systems, software, and virtually defined networks that support 5th and future generations mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1934

*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 “Promoting United States International Leadership in 5G Act of 2021”.

#### SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States and its allies and partners should maintain participation and leadership at international standards-setting bodies for 5th and future generations mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure;

(2) the United States should work with its allies and partners to encourage and facilitate the development of secure supply chains