

□ 1237

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.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I did not vote on Roll Call vote No. 304 as I was chairing a Ways and Means Committee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE on Roll Call No. 304, Providing for consideration of the following bills: (H.R. 7900) National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2023; (S. 3373) Protecting Our Gold Star Families Education Act; (H.R. 8296) Women's Health Protection Act; (H.R. 8297) Ensuring Women's Right to Reproductive Freedom Act; and (H.R. 6538) Active Shooter Alert Act.

Stated against:

Mr. CAREY. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 304.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Correa)	Higgins (NY)	Payne (Pallone)
Bentz (LaMalfa)	(Pallone)	Pingree (Kuster)
Bowman (Evans)	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Neguse)
Brown (MD)	(Jeffries)	Ryan (Beyer)
(Evans)	Kahele (Correa)	Salazar
Cárdenas (Correa)	Katko (Meijer)	(Gimenez)
Carter (GA)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Sires (Pallone)
(Mace)	Lawrence (Stevens)	Soto (Castor)
Castro (TX)	Leger Fernandez (Kuster)	(FL))
(Neguse)	Lieu (Beyer)	Speier (Correa)
Cherifilus-McCormick (Evans)	Meng (Kuster)	Steel (Obernolte)
Doggett (Beyer)	Moore (WI)	Taylor (Pfluger)
Fallon (Gonzales, Tony)	(Beyer)	Timmons (Armstrong)
Hartzler (Bacon)	Moulton (Stevens)	Torres (NY)
	Newman (Beyer)	(Carter (LA))
	Panetta (Beyer)	Trahan (Stevens)
	Pappas (Kuster)	Walorski (Baird)
	Pascall (Pallone)	Williams (GA)
		(Carter (LA))
		Wilson (SC)
		(Lamborn)

ACTIVE SHOOTER ALERT ACT OF
2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up the bill (H.R. 6538) to create an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network, 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. DESAULNIER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, 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 in-

formation 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. 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 New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. 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.R. 6538.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6538, the Active Shooter Alert Act, is bipartisan legislation that would improve the tools available to law enforcement as they respond to the disturbingly frequent threat of active shooters faced by our communities.

Far too many of our cities have experienced the threat of an active shooter situation. Since we last voted on this very bill—only a few weeks ago—Highland Park became the most recent city to face the terror of a mass shooting, following Buffalo, Uvalde, and so many others.

In 2021, the FBI designated 61 situations as active shooter incidents, a more than 50 percent increase compared to 2020, and nearly double the number of such incidents just 4 years ago.

These incidents require law enforcement to make challenging decisions about how best to keep the public safe, including when and how to inform the public as a situation unfolds. FEMA, the FCC, and wireless providers already have a system in place to send time-sensitive, location-targeted alerts for weather emergencies, AMBER Alerts for child abduction cases, and other public safety emergencies.

This bill simply enables law enforcement to use this system for active shooter alerts, giving them an additional tool to save lives. It is bipartisan legislation and should be completely uncontroversial.

Indeed, our colleagues overwhelmingly supported this legislation when we last voted on it, but the opposition of a few Members prevented it from garnering the two-thirds support it needed to pass under suspension of the rules. Those Members in opposition have made absurd claims about the bill—instead of examining what it actually does—but we won’t take the bait.

Instead, we are listening to our law enforcement and first responders who have called for this legislation. Today, we are taking action to save lives when tragedy strikes. We will continue to do much more to actually prevent these tragedies, but the least we can do is to improve the tools we give law enforcement to respond to a crisis. That is what this bill does.

H.R. 6538, the Active Shooter Alert Act, directs the attorney general to appoint a coordinator to work with Federal, State, local, and Tribal Governments to better use our existing emergency alert system for active shooter situations.

It directs the coordinator to establish an advisory panel, comprised of law enforcement officers who have re-

sponded to active shooter incidents, along with other public safety and emergency response experts.

□ 1245

The coordinator is also directed to establish best practices for using emergency alerts for active shooter incidents, to promote the adoption of those best practices, and to report to Congress on the effectiveness of these alerts. This bipartisan legislation is endorsed by a broad range of Federal, State, and local law enforcement organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CICILLINE for his work in developing this important legislation, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it once again, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we debated this exact bill 3 weeks ago, and it failed with bipartisan opposition. That is right. Even Democrats voted against it.

The Active Shooter Alert Act is an unnecessary gimmick to cede more authority to the already highly politicized Biden Department of Justice.

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, IPAWS, 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 were more than 1,400 alerting authorities across the country.

If the States are already using an alerting system to notify the public about threats, what is this bill really doing?

This bill is creating a new Federal job at the Biden Justice Department to encourage State and local governments to issue public alerts any time a firearm is used anywhere. Don’t take my word for it. During the markup, Congressman JONES said 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 fearmongering that guns are an ever-present threat and we cannot be safe until Big Government rounds up every last one of them.

In fact, Congressman JONES went further, calling the committee to consider another bill that would ban assault weapons. Chairman NADLER followed by voicing his support.

It is no wonder Democrats want to push forward a bill that would create a reminder about this threat of gun violence against us. They want to create a culture of fear so they can achieve their ultimate goal. If they really

wanted to improve emergency alerts for active shooters, we would be moving a bill to improve the system that is already in place that are sent to mobile devices.

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

For example, GAO found that one alerting authority sent an alert to a specific geographic area to warn the recipients about a suspicious package, but the alert was received by people located 4 miles outside of the intended target area.

Another concern is that these alerts are one-way communication systems so alerting officials have no way of knowing if the messages are actually received by the public. GAO has also found that another local alerting authority sent an evacuation order through an alert but didn't know whether the intended recipients actually even received that notice.

Utilizing these alerts for active shooter incidents could have tragic consequences. This is yet another reason this legislation should not have been rushed to the floor without going through regular committee order. We could have had hearings, we could have received expert testimony, and we could have been able to fully vet this initiative.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee and sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill that I introduced with my colleague from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the bipartisan Active Shooter Alert Act that we introduced along with 14 Democrats and 14 Republicans—fully bipartisan.

This bill is a commonsense piece of public safety legislation that police have asked for over and over and over again and that we are past due in delivering to them. It is so clear that they need it.

Between 2000 and 2020 there were close to 400 active shooter events with 40 active shooter incidents in 2020 alone. Last year we saw 61 active shooter events.

We see what this looks like in our communities. This past April a shooter gunned down 10 people in a New York City subway and then was on the run for 29 hours. On July 4 another shooter gunned down parade goers in Highland Park, Illinois, and evaded arrest for 8 hours. Those are just two examples of the most recent ones.

This doesn't even include the shooters who were at large for hours and hours in Midland and Odessa in 2019 and the Atlanta, Georgia, area in 2021;

Kalamazoo, Michigan, in 2016; and in too many other life-and-death situations for our communities.

Active shooter emergencies have become so common that we barely even register them anymore. We have become numb to them and starting to view them as statistics. We cannot let this become normal. And law enforcement can't and won't get used to these horrific incidents because police are the ones who have to respond to every single shooting. We left them to turn to platforms like Twitter and Facebook to let the public know there is a shooter out there.

That is why law enforcement organizations from all across the country are asking for this bill.

Enough is enough.

We want to talk about supporting our law enforcement?

Give them what they ask for.

Stop acting like you are experts about responding to active shooting. They are. They risk their lives every day doing it.

This bill creates and makes available to local law enforcement an AMBER Alert-like program for active shooter events. It will provide departments with cutting-edge technology to send notifications to our smartphones and let communities know if there is an active shooter in a certain area.

In addition to this system, the bill calls for the development of best practices so that departments know how to send alerts in the most effective and safest way possible.

We already have this type of alert infrastructure available at the Federal level. Let's maximize its potential to save lives and give officers the tools they need to keep their communities safe.

Developing this kind of technology and infrastructure and identifying best practices would be a massive undertaking for many local departments and for some communities. They simply don't have the resources to do it on their own.

And nothing—let me repeat—nothing in this bill is mandatory for law enforcement agencies to adopt. So if a local department determines that this program isn't a good fit for their community, they simply don't have to use it. But for the officers out there who do want it, let's deliver to them.

We have to give law enforcement every tool they need to neutralize these threats and keep our communities safe. This bill helps do that in a simple and effective way. It is not complicated. It simply adds a tool to the tool belt of law enforcement all across the country regardless of their size or location to be used voluntarily.

When there is an active shooter situation, law enforcement does all they can to keep people in the surrounding area safe. They organize to search for shooters posing the threat, they shut down streets and buildings and provide first response to victims, and they go door to door to either evacuate or tell

people to shelter in place. But that takes time—time that could cost lives.

In these stressful life-or-death situations, law enforcement are too often relying on social media to warn people so that no one accidentally walks into the line of fire or a crime scene. Law enforcement deserves better than Twitter to communicate with the community they serve.

I am proud this bill has the endorsement of law enforcement agencies all across the country, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Police Foundation, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the National Association of Police Officers, and the National Association of District Attorneys, just to name a few.

There has been resounding bipartisan support. I thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have supported this commonsense measure. I thank, again, my friend and colleague, Mr. UPTON, for working on this bill. I encourage all of you to give law enforcement the tools they need to keep themselves and communities safe.

Do not listen to this nonsense about trying to take peoples' guns or give the Biden Justice Department money. It has nothing to do with that. It is about alerting people when there is a dangerous active shooting happening in their community so we can save peoples' lives. It is plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just add that the gentleman said it has nothing to do with the Biden Justice Department. Well, it certainly does. It gives \$2 million to the Biden Justice Department to create a program the States can already do. This is the same Biden Justice Department that is the most political Justice Department we have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, maybe someone should have sent an active shooter alert to police in Uvalde. Wait. They had the alert. They were in a school building with an active shooter and didn't take action.

America is at her best when she encourages her citizens to have safe, responsible gun ownership. But under Democrats, instead, we have a government that instead wants to stigmatize and scare people about guns.

Mr. Speaker, imagine you are at a concert with 5,000 people and everyone gets an alert on their phone "active shooter" because six blocks away there was a gunfire that went off. Maybe it was an accident. Maybe it was a tragedy.

Would that make the circumstance safer?

Of course not. It would lead to stampede, tragedy, hysteria, mistake, perhaps even more death. This bill is like yelling "fire" in a movie theater, except the fire is in another movie theater across the street. The bill makes no mention of distance requirements.

Will we be notified of any active shootings within 1 mile, 5 miles, 10 miles?

What is an active shooter?

A drive-by in an inner city?

A spousal murder in a suburb?

If you live in or near Democrat-run cities, it sounds like your phone will be buzzing off the hook. Some of our cities have shootings every day where multiple people are injured, and often this happens in the jurisdictions with the most intense and liberty-depriving gun control.

The bill states that an active shooter is defined as an individual “determined to pose an active, imminent threat to people in a populated area.” That sounds like a sizable amount of the people walking around the south side of Chicago every day.

Who is making this determination?

Is it in a millisecond?

By the time the alerts go out, it may be far too late to do any good. This bill is useless and foolish. Working on police response times is, of course, a worthy goal, a worthy goal for the States where the Constitution resides the police power. But alerting thousands of people to what may or may not have happened 30 minutes ago or 30 blocks away is, in fact, dangerous.

So one has to ask: What is the true purpose of this bill?

Why do the Democrats want to use the power of government to bombard your cellphone with active shooter alerts 24 hours a day, 7 days a week?

It is because they want you to be afraid of the Second Amendment. It is because they want you to be afraid of responsible gun ownership. They hope that if they program you and bombard you long enough, that you will hate your own Second Amendment rights, or you may tattle on your neighbor who is lawfully and rightfully exercising theirs. The American people should not fall for this.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that if the theater across street were on fire, I would like to know about it. Fires spread.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the chair very much for yielding.

Let me acknowledge both my good friend, Mr. CICILLINE, and my good friend, Mr. UPTON, for their thoughtfulness.

Let me provide a response and relief to my good friend from Florida. First of all, I champion the heroes who run into burning buildings, law enforcement that save persons who are under attack, and the outstanding heroes of natural disasters and manmade disasters. They are valuable.

But I do want to answer the question that we have seen, i.e., Uvalde a lot of good guys with guns and nothing happened. And so this active shooter legislation is common sense. Let me dispel

your fears. There is modern-day technology that experts run by FEMA under the DOJ will, in fact, be able in this active shooter legislation pinpoint where the active shooter may be.

I have here a list of shootings that have gone on in Uvalde; Buffalo; Boulder, Colorado; Atlanta; Dayton; El Paso; Virginia Beach; Thousand Oaks; Pittsburgh; Parkland; Sutherland; Las Vegas; Orlando; Oregon; Rosenberg; and Oak Creek.

I can assure you that the active shooter legislation would have been effective.

□ 1300

Individuals had gotten the guns legally, allegedly, but no one gave notice to those people that a shooting was going on.

In recent weeks and months and years, we have mourned the loss of life resulting from an ever-increasing number of active shooters. Communities in every corner of this country are suffering.

For instance, eight people were killed roughly 30 miles apart in three spas. No active shooter alert. If that had been done, someone could have been prepared that an active shooter that had a propensity to go into spas was killing people. He ran around creating havoc.

We know what happened in Uvalde, Texas—no notice that there was havoc going on in Robb Elementary School. Tell that to the parents.

Highland Park, Illinois, a Fourth of July parade ended abruptly as the shooting came. If we had had that, there might have been relief.

Please realize that we are here trying to save lives. In saving lives, yes, we want a ban on the assault weapons, but we would hope that you would join us on a bipartisan bill that will simply notify people what is happening, not deny them their due process rights.

H.R. 6538 is an important bill that would authorize the Department of Justice to coordinate an active shooter alert network. We will be listening to law enforcement and those with technology to ensure that the system works.

AMBER Alerts, for those of us in disaster territory and storm territory, work.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will not leave the floor without trying my best to give the names from Uvalde: Makenna, Layla, Maranda, Nevaeh, Jose, Xavier, Tess, Rojelio, Eliahna, Eliahna, Annabell, Jackie, Uziyah, Jayce, Maite, Jailah, Irma, Eva, Amerie, Alexandria, and Alithia; and those of this great community of Buffalo: Roberta, Margus, Andre, Aaron, Geraldine, Celestine, Heyward, Katherine, Pearl, and Ruth. These are people who have died. Highland will have their list of names added to this.

Support the AMBER Alert that makes the difference in an active shooting so that even though there are good guys out there, you can tell the people to save their lives. For the little 2-year-old that we will hear about soon, support the legislation.

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.

In May this year, as we all know, 19 fourth graders and two teachers in Uvalde, Texas were slaughtered in a mass shooting that began when the perpetrator shot his grandmother in the home they shared, drove away, and crashed his vehicle outside Robb Elementary, where he entered and committed unspeakable acts.

And just a week ago in Highland Park, Illinois, a Fourth of July parade ended abruptly when a shooter opened fire on spectators, then fled the scene, prompting a citywide search.

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.

We all saw the video of the band members in Highland Park who continued to march along the parade route as shots rang out above their heads. We saw the confused looks on the faces of the spectators as they tried to determine if the loud bangs were gunshots or fireworks.

An Active Shooter Alert could have helped those people fully ascertain the danger they were in and get to safety faster. An 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.

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.

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 to mobile devices within their communities using the same system that issues AMBER Alerts, severe storm and extreme weather events warnings, and other emergency situations.

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 would oversee establishment of the advisory panel; establish and promote adoption of the best practices; and coordinate with FEMA, the Department of Transportation, and the FCC 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 many agencies will elect to participate based on the many endorsements received from law enforcement agencies.

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

VALDE SHOOTING VICTIMS

Makenna Lee Elrod, 10

Layla Salazar, 11

Maranda Mathis, 11

Nevaeh Bravo, 10

Jose Manuel Flores Jr., 10

Xavier Lopez, 10

Tess Marie Mata, 10

Rojelio Torres, 10

Eliahna "Ellie" Amyah Garcia, 9; who was just days from turning 10 years old

Eliahna A. Torres, 10

Annabell Guadalupe Rodriguez, 10; cousin and best friend to Jackie Cazares, 9, another victim

Uziyah Garcia

Jayce Carmelo Luevanos, 10

Maite Yuleana Rodriguez, 10

Jailah Nicole Silguero, 10

Irma Garcia, 48; a teacher of over two decades

Eva Mireles, 44

Amerie Jo Garza, 10

Alexandria "Lexi" Aniyah Rubio, 10

Alithia Ramirez, 10

BUFFALO SHOOTING VICTIMS

Robert A. Drury of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 32

Margus D. Morrison of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 52

Andre Mackneil of Auburn, N.Y.—age 53

Aaron Salter of Lockport, N.Y.—age 55
Geraldine Talley of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 62
Celestine Chaney of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 65
Heyward Patterson of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 67
Katherine Massey of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 72
Pearl Young of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 77
Ruth Whitfield of Buffalo, N.Y.—age 86

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my friend.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) a few minutes ago with respect to his position about what this bill will do in terms of fear and its purpose of creating fear among the people. That is the reality. That is what we are dealing with here.

Texas has an alert system. States have alert systems. That is where this properly resides. That is where the police power resides, in the States.

In fact, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee even acknowledged this reality that, well, okay, States have this, but here is a Federal program we are going to create with \$2 million. You can use it if you want.

This is another example of Washington creating another department, another position, spending more money that we don't have in order to have a policy objective of continuing to advance fear among the American people.

Remember the COVID alerts? How many alerts do we need on our phones to create fear in the minds of the American people?

Allow the States to make a decision about when there is something that is meritorious, whether it is a tornado alert, whether it is an AMBER Alert. Allow the local jurisdictions to make that decision, not bureaucrats in Washington. That is the reality.

I think it would probably be a more advantageous use of our time to develop a congressional stupidity alert system or a congressional harm alert system. I mean, we do it every single day. That is what this body is actually engaged in on a regular basis, harming the American people through either nonaction or action.

As we speak, maybe we should have an alert about the inflation running rampant around this country because of the rampant spending, as evidenced by this very bill with another \$2 million for a position in the Department of Justice.

Maybe we need an alert system for the literal stream of people coming across the border in Eagle Pass right now and the fentanyl pouring across into our communities, endangering the American people, empowering cartels at our peril.

Maybe, perhaps, we need an alert system for more COVID mandates, more mask mandates, and more shutdowns in our schools where our children get harmed and where they have mental health issues because of what this body does.

Maybe we need an alert system for the wokeism and the vax mandates at the Department of Defense that are

damaging our ability to recruit. Just now, on the floor this week, we are going to be taking up the National Defense Authorization Act. We can't even attain 40 percent recruiting standards right now in our United States Army because of wokeism and because of vaccine mandates driving our personnel away from the Department of Defense. Maybe we need an alert system for the American people to know what is happening at the Department of Defense.

Maybe we need an alert on our failures to vote, our proxy voting in this very body, and our virtual voting from boats by some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We could have so many alert systems that we could be actually educating the American people on what they are getting here in this august body, the people's House. That would be a more valuable alert system than carrying out the function of the State and local police power that is inherent in our Constitution, which this body tramples upon on a regular and daily basis.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), one of the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

This morning, I saw the news that the North Carolina Little League State championship was canceled. That is right. Why? An active shooter.

I saw the frantic video of a mom holding her handheld video of what was going on. Frankly, it reminded me of the congressional baseball practice in Alexandria a few years ago when our Republican whip, STEVE SCALISE, was seriously injured and, frankly, lucky to still be alive.

My son played on that field, which is walking distance from my home. Some of my staff actually walked by that morning, not having a clue what was going on.

This bill would change that. It would provide some resources—not an arm or a leg, but maybe what it takes for a traffic safety study—to provide an alert system across the country on your cell phone when an active shooter might be close by.

It would work like an AMBER Alert system, just like I received when I landed at O'Hare yesterday, coming back to Washington. My phone went off, as others' did on my flight when it landed, looking for what may have been a child predator.

A few years ago, six folks were shot and killed in Kalamazoo, in my district, next to the campus of Western Michigan University, a campus of some 20,000 students, at about midnight. No alert system was sent. I believe that this legislation, had it been in place then, may have saved some of those folks who were killed that night.

In the 1990s, two brave Capitol Hill police officers were shot and killed just down the stairs from this Chamber as they tried to kill our Republican whip, Tom DeLay. Then, as Members of Congress, we had no such alert system. Today, we do.

In fact, just this morning, we each received two notices of police activity on Capitol Hill, just as we did a couple of weeks ago on the day that we had this legislation up when Independence Avenue was closed because of a suspicious package outside the door of the Cannon Building.

A week ago, on the Fourth of July, the Nation watched in horror the mass shooting in Highland Park. The media reports the initial sounds were thought to be fireworks. Wouldn't it have been nice to have had a system that would have alerted the entire parade route to take cover? Maybe some of those folks that were killed or wounded wouldn't have been. It breaks our hearts.

Tragically, there are going to be more days like that, probably today. Can't we take a small, bipartisan, commonsense measure to save a life or two?

Yes, I believe in thoughts and prayers. I do. I also believe in taking constructive steps to protect our communities.

Every single law enforcement agency supports this. It is way past time to do something.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SÁNCHEZ). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Sadly, I know that the Gun Owners of America opposes this bill, but it does nothing to threaten the legal use of any gun. It only protects humans that, in fact, may be the target.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), the co-chair of the Second Amendment Caucus.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, before I talk about the substance of this bill, or the lack thereof, I would like to put it in the context of the other dozen or so unserious, unconstitutional, unnecessary, and unsafe responses to gun shootings in this country that the Democrats have offered and passed in this Chamber.

What have they done? Well, they passed a law to ban magazines with a capacity of more than 15 rounds. The chairman of the Rules Committee claimed that this would stop shootings like the one at Virginia Tech. What he failed to mention is the shooter at Virginia Tech never used a magazine that had more than 15 rounds. That is an example of an unserious solution that has come from this body.

What else have they done? They have changed the definition of a gun dealer so that any law-abiding individual who sells a firearm to anybody and makes a profit off it now might be a gun dealer and, therefore, prosecutable in a Federal crime.

What else have they done that is unserious or unconstitutional? Well, they have passed a law to ban gun trafficking. The problem is that is already illegal.

Who did they sweep up in this dragnet in this new law? Well, they swept up domestic violence victims who might ask a neighbor for a firearm. Now, they can be prosecuted. Not the neighbor, not just the Good Samaritan, but also the domestic violence victim can be prosecuted as a gun trafficker under a bill that they passed here.

Recognizing this flaw, I offered an amendment to fix it in the Judiciary Committee. Every Democrat but one—one of them had a little bit of common sense—voted against that amendment to fix their own bill.

What else have they done? Well, they passed a bill that I am going to call unconstitutional on arrival. It has already been ruled unconstitutional if you read the D.C. v. Heller decision. The Supreme Court Justices said that you can't force Mr. Dick Heller to keep his gun unloaded and disassembled in his house because that violates the Second Amendment. But that is exactly what one of their laws that came through this Chamber in just the past couple of months does. It is called the so-called safe storage act. It is already unconstitutional.

Who likes this bill more than anybody? Home invaders. Oh, my gosh, wouldn't it be great to know that, by Federal law, everybody who has a firearm now has to have it locked up and unattainable, inaccessible in the amount of time that it would take to respond to a home invader?

What else have they done? A red flag bill that deprives citizens of their due process and endangers police officers, who are going to be required to respond in predawn raids of people who haven't had due process, have never had their day in court, haven't even reached a level of evidence that is sufficient. The red flag bill is bad.

What else have they done? They passed a bill to deprive 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds of purchasing semiautomatic rifles and semiautomatic shotguns. They are already deprived of their constitutional right to buy a handgun, but now we are just going to sweep in all of these things.

Are they going to then raise the draft age to 21 now that we are saying Uncle Sam will give you a gun? Uncle Sam can conscript you to the military, send you overseas to fight for a Constitution that doesn't even protect you or your wife, who is at home taking care of the kids, if you are 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds.

They don't care. This one is also unconstitutional on arrival. The Ninth Circuit, one of the most liberal circuits in the country, has already ruled that.

Why is this so disturbing? We heard earlier today from one of my colleagues in this debate that she wants to ban assault weapons. Well, the House Democrat Twitter account tweeted that all semiautomatic rifles are weapons of war. Really? There are a lot of people in Kentucky who own Remington 750 deer rifles who are going to be shocked to find out that they purchased a weapon of war. If you

saw one of these, I think you would all agree this is not a weapon of war.

It is an alarm to every American who is out there watching this debate that they are coming after your guns.

Now, let's get to the substance of this bill, or the lack thereof. Why are we here debating this bill? This is the second time we have voted on it, the second time we debated it. Why are we here again? Because they tried to suspend the rules of this body and get it through without following the rules of this House, and they failed. That is why we are here again, to give it the debate it deserves.

The bill is called the Active Shooter Alert Act of 2022. In the Democrat cities where they defunded the police, I think you should call it the you are on your own act of 2022. Yes, that is right.

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 Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. They are going to tell you that you are on your own.

But can you turn this thing off in Chicago? How will you get any sleep because you have a shooting literally every night in Chicago? If they were serious about stopping crime or helping individuals, this would have been called the active violence alert act.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, what about violence committed with a car, violence committed with a knife? No concern for that because the true purpose of this bill passing here today is to scare people. It is to scare people on their phones. They can't get away from their phones.

It is going to be popping up saying, be afraid, somebody's got a gun, and they are going to try and condition the American public to ask to repeal the Second Amendment, either explicitly or implicitly, here in this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill.

□ 1315

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, we are hearing a lot of arguments today. My colleague on the other side talked about America at its best. Let me tell you about America at its best.

Last Monday on July 4 in Highland Park, Illinois, thousands of people gathered together. Families, parents, grandparents, and children lined the road for a parade. Many of them came there year after year, generation after generation, to celebrate the birth of our country, the values of our Founders, and the belief that this is a Nation for us all. I saw America at its best.

At 10:14 on July 4 last week, a shooter who had climbed a roof with an AR-15 fired 83 bullets in less than a minute, killing seven people and wounding dozens of others.

Thousands of people fled that parade, the best America has to offer, not

knowing where to go, not knowing what to do. They heard there was a shooter. Was it one? Was it two? It could have been many. Should they go home, or should they go somewhere else? Nobody knew.

Imagine if on their phones they had been told of an active shooter at the corner of Second and Central. Imagine if on their phones, they had been told, go and seek safety in your home. For 8 hours, people watched, people talked, rumors swirled. An entire community of 30,000 people was left to grieve and to fear.

That is what this bill is about. That is why we are here. We are here to give the people of Highland Park or of the many communities around our country that have experienced an active shooter, or will experience an active shooter, a little bit of security.

According to the FBI, last year there were 61 active shooting incidents in the country. That was last year alone and double the year before. We are seeing more violence in our country. We have to do something about this violence.

I know the people who are arguing against this bill aren't willing to do that. They are not willing to stand up and defend our communities, to keep our children safe from this kind of violence. They are not even willing to give our communities the information they need to seek safety on their own.

We have to take action to stop these killings in our communities, but that is not what this bill is about. This bill is about getting people the critical, potentially lifesaving information in a quick and efficient way in the event of a shooter. That is what this bill is about. That is why I am asking people to vote for it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. So as others have said—and this is the language that struck me—when this matter was in committee, before it failed under suspension of the rules here, for good reason, this paragraph struck me.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, “imminent threat alerts include natural or human-made disasters, extreme weather, active shooters, and other threatening emergencies that are current or emerging.” So the existing IPAWS system explicitly covers this issue, which again, takes you back to, then, what this debate has materialized as.

The soon-to-retire gentleman from Michigan on the Republican side recited an event in North Carolina where Little League teams withdrew from a tournament because they heard shots. The police in Wilson say that they had no evidence that there was an active shooter involved.

That incident had nothing to do with what we are talking about today, and yet, the gentleman from Michigan offered it in support of this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman who just spoke about the

Highland Park shooting in Illinois—by the way, according to the wisdom of the majority and some Republican Senators, we passed support for red flag laws—well, Illinois has a red flag law. That person had been implicated in all circumstances that a red flag law ought to respond to. It didn't work.

We have been doing gun control since 1968. Are you satisfied with the trajectory? Does it salve your conscience to speak in a loud voice about how outraged you are and do something else that has no capacity to solve the problem?

Because you refuse to grapple with the problem. I have said that all along. I am going to continue to say it. It is not the prevalence of guns. It is but for causation, ladies and gentlemen.

We have always had guns in ample supply across this country. Always. But until the 1960s, you never heard of a mass shooting, and they have increased at a rapid rate in recent years. So it is not the guns that have changed.

Let's look at what may have changed. We have changed the culture. Could that be it? Could that be the reason that some reckless idiot in an automobile leaving the area of that Little League tournament was engaged in gun play, firing off a weapon? That never would have happened at an earlier time in this country.

The same political forces that tried to change the culture and succeeded is the side that wants to eliminate gun rights as the answer to a problem they have created.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. So we see it over and over and over again. Accountability would require you to point to the success of your actions. You have engaged in—Mr. MASSIE detailed them—bill after bill after bill after bill, slowly eroding people's gun rights away.

Yet, the problems that you have caused get worse every year. They get worse every year in the cities that you control.

Let's grapple with the problem, and let's stop the alarmism and the stigmatizing and the fearmongering that you believe to substitute for policy. It does not.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER and all of the hands that have made this moment possible.

Madam Speaker, I have been here in this House when we have given our thoughts and prayers to many persons who have died, many as a result of an active shooter circumstance.

Thoughts and prayers are important. My grandfather was a preacher. He talked about thoughts and prayers, but

he also talked about doing God's work. Thoughts and prayers are important, but thoughts and prayers are not enough. Thoughts and prayers, unfortunately, are not saving lives when we can make the difference.

“ . . . here on earth, God's work must truly be our own.” These are the words of John F. Kennedy. Thoughts and prayers are not enough.

There seems to be an argument today that we can give too much notice. Too much notice. We already have a system that can do this. Too much notice. Ask the loved ones of those who lost lives in the Atlanta, Georgia, area. Ask those loved ones if there was too much notice.

I went there. I saw them. I saw the hurt and the pain. I saw them pleading for additional help. Thoughts and prayers are not enough.

You can't give too much notice. Too much notice? Well, this shooter in Atlanta went to three different spas over a 3-hour period. Three different spas. I do believe this is an active shooter. Killed eight people—eight people—three different spas over a 3-hour period. This is an active shooter. Didn't have too much notice.

I believe that we have a duty, responsibility, and obligation to do all that we can. When you can't do enough, you still have a responsibility to do all that we can. This is an opportunity for us to do more to save lives.

For edification purposes, since 1968—1968—more individuals in the United States have died from gun violence than in battles during all the wars the country has fought since its inception.

Since 1968, more individuals in the United States have died from gun violence than in battle during all the wars since this country's inception.

Too much is not enough. Too much notice is not enough, and we don't have enough.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, back in high school when I was a senior at a pregame warm-up at Carthage, I had my hands under the center about to take a snap, throw a pass—the manager had my helmet—I am looking at the split end, and the manager yelled, LOUIE, and I looked up in time to have my nose splattered all over my face.

That is what this warning will be. It is not going to stop violence. It is just going to say, look, we have got more violence.

Let's talk about what it really is. The truth is, these cities with the most violence in America—and there are already 1,400 warning systems that will already take care of this, but, apparently, we need more help in the big cities controlled by Democrats.

We are not going to lower the crime rate. I have spent much of my adult life in courtrooms dealing with crime. I am familiar with what causes it, what happens. My heart has gone out repeatedly to victims, but you have got to reduce crime.

How can we do that? We have brought up repeatedly in committee over the years, 17 and a half years I have been here, look, let's go to the heart of what is causing the crime.

I saw a recent report that said fatherlessness definitely is affecting the crime. It definitely is affecting the violence. It is increasing the violence.

We have always had guns, but we haven't had mass shootings like this, mass killings. The culture has changed. Then we see this administration is going to help deal with problems around the world by giving grants to groups that will promote atheism and humanism. As if we are not doing enough damage. Because as Adam said, this Constitution was meant for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the governing of any other.

If we want to deal with shooters, don't take away guns from law-abiding people. Look where the mass shootings are. They like to go where there is nobody law-abiding that has a gun.

And what about the border? The border has drugs pouring across, drugs that have added tens of billions a year to the drug cartels that engage in violence and are now located in cities all over America.

So I would just submit, you know, this is going to be, if it is passed—and the Democrats have the majority. They have the White House. They have the Senate. If it passes, you know, it is going to be in the big cities.

They are not going to reduce their crime. So I would suggest if they are going to be going 24/7, at least get some nice music on there so maybe that will be soothing. Maybe some good Paul Williams songs, because it is not going to stop crime. Maybe some good music will make people feel better.

□ 1330

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE).

Ms. MACE. Madam Speaker, in South Carolina, unfortunately, we are no stranger to mass shootings.

Seven years ago in June, we had nine Black church members at Mother Emanuel who were murdered in cold blood by a single killer.

On April 26 of this year, right adjacent to a little league baseball game in the evening, in a parking lot, over 30 shots were fired. The harrowing video of seeing young kids literally crawling off the baseball field in tears, parents frightened, scared to death about their children and this shooting had taken place just next door.

On Memorial Day of this year in Charleston, there were 13 people shot that evening, including three law enforcement officers, to say nothing of the hundreds of mass shootings that we have seen so far this year, including over two dozen in our schools and Uvalde.

More recently Highland Park—and I will mention that my father's last duty

station in the military as a U.S. Army General was at Fort Sheridan, Illinois. I spent a year of my life in Highland Park going to Highland Park Middle School. I am very familiar with that community and have been heartbroken by what they have been through over the last few weeks.

And in Chicago, there are mass shootings every single weekend.

The beauty of H.R. 6538 is that I agree with both sides of the aisle and what they are saying today. As someone who owns seven firearms, a rifle, two shotguns, and four pistols, I support law-abiding citizens' right to own firearms included in the Second Amendment. The beauty of this bill is it is not requiring or demanding or mandating anything. It is not taking away anyone's Second Amendment rights.

When I have spoken to law enforcement across not just the First Congressional District, but across the entire State of South Carolina, when I speak to sheriffs, when I speak to police chiefs, I realize and understand that there is a patchwork of technology out there that some are aware of, some are not.

So, for example, in one county in my State, we have something called code red where residents can opt in. Another county has nothing, another municipality or locality can do a reverse 911, but there is nothing consistent. The beauty of this bill is it doesn't infringe on anyone's Second Amendment rights.

It does do a study by the Comptroller General under section 5 to understand what States are and aren't doing and what some of the best practices are.

In section 4, we have an advisory panel that is created, their job—and these are law enforcement officers, these are everyday first responders, people who are in the thick of it every single day facing these mass shootings—is putting together best practices so that the coordinator, as defined in section 3, can provide this information. This encourages States and localities and municipalities what the best practices are, and helps provide that information to them and the tools that they need so the next time—it is not a matter of "if" but a matter of "when"—the next mass shooting is, they can, if they want, if they choose to voluntarily alert those in the community.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I oppose H.R. 6538. Frankly, this bill is unnecessary. Nothing prevents the States today from creating an alert system for active shooter incidents. Every State has the capacity to implement a warning system if they choose to.

In fact, in 2020, the GAO said there are more than 1,400 systems already in

place throughout the country that make this available. We passed here, just 4 or 5 years ago, the Ashlynne Mike AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act. That cleared up a lot of holes throughout the country on these emergency alert systems. This really is duplicative, and is, quite frankly, not necessary.

Contrary to the belief of many Members of this body, the solution to every issue is not a Federal program. We should allow States, who have the ability, to create systems for providing emergency notifications for their citizens in a manner that is best for them.

What this does is by putting a Federal coordinator over there, it actually lays in place the infrastructure for a soon-to-be-mandated system that the States will have to fund, but it will be mandated by the Federal Government. That is my prognostication here because that is what always happens.

DOJ can already issue best practices and guidance related to public safety alerts. So what is this? This is a bill designed to feel good. This is a visceral bill, an emotional bill. This is not a bill designed to make us safer, make Americans safer. We already have those mechanisms and means in place.

We have spent a lot of time going over bills introduced by my colleagues across the aisle regarding gun violence. Very few of them are going to provide any kind of help and assistance. There are bills that we have introduced that will not get a hearing that I believe will actually provide help and safety for the American people.

This bill, however, by creating this Federal alert system—and it is not a Federal alert system, but it will evolve into that—is to remind us always that gun violence exists all around us, and it is to basically prejudice people against lawful gun owners.

One of the best things you can have, regardless of what my colleagues across the aisle say, is a trained good guy with a gun.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume while I am waiting because I have one more speaker who would like to weigh in.

As has been said, this bill is redundant. States can already do it if they so choose. This bill is part of a series of legislation that the Democrats have passed that attacks law-abiding citizens' Second Amendment liberties.

We know what happened a few weeks ago with the red flag law that was passed by this body. Someone doesn't like you, and they go to law enforcement or they go to a judge. There is a hearing. You are not allowed to be at the hearing. You are not allowed to have your lawyer at the hearing. You are not allowed to confront your accuser. You haven't been charged with a crime, but they can take your gun, take your property, take away your Second Amendment right, and then

you have to go petition the court to get it back.

This bill gives \$2 million to the Department of Justice. I mean, giving more money to the Justice Department, the most politicized Justice Department I have ever seen, the same Justice Department where over a dozen whistleblowers have come to our office talking about concerns they have with investigations that the FBI and the Justice Department are doing, the same Justice Department that treated parents as domestic terrorists for simply showing up at school board meetings and voicing concerns about the curriculum being taught to their children, that Justice Department, we are giving more money to do this program?

The same Justice Department that, sad to say, has joined the effort by the left to intimidate the Court, our highest Court in the land, we are giving money to that Justice Department?

Make no mistake, this Justice Department has done that by their failure to enforce the statute to protect our Supreme Court Justices. When people are protesting at their home, trying to impact and intimidate the Court, this Justice Department refused to deal with the statute that is exactly on point. We are giving money to that Justice Department.

So for all those reasons, we have real concerns with this legislation, and I would urge opposition to the bill.

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

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

There is a reason that this bipartisan legislation is endorsed by the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Policing Institute, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and several State and local law enforcement organizations.

When tragedy strikes—and unfortunately we know that it will strike again—we want our law enforcement and first responders to have all the tools they need to keep our communities safe. We want our people to have the warnings that they need, just as with the AMBER Alert system.

I urge my colleagues to stand with law enforcement and to support this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, 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. JORDAN. Madam 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 question are postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol on Thursday, July 14, 2022, for the lying in honor of the remains of Hershel Woodrow "Woody" Williams, the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient for acts performed during World War II.

PROTECTING OUR GOLD STAR FAMILIES EDUCATION ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up the bill (S. 3373), as amended, to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-56, is considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 3373

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022" or the "Honoring our PACT Act of 2022".

(b) **MATTERS RELATING TO AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.**—

(1) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, when in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

(2) **AMENDMENTS TO TABLES OF CONTENTS.**—

Except as otherwise expressly provided, when an amendment made by this Act to title 38, United States Code, adds a section or larger organizational unit to that title or amends the designation or heading of a section or larger organizational unit in that title, that amendment also shall have the effect of amending any table of sections in that title to alter the table to conform to the changes made by the amendment.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; references to title 38, United States Code; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXPANSION OF HEALTH CARE ELIGIBILITY

Subtitle A—Toxic-exposed Veterans

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Definitions relating to toxic-exposed veterans.

Sec. 103. Expansion of health care for specific categories of toxic-exposed veterans and veterans supporting certain overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 104. Assessments of implementation and operation.

Subtitle B—Certain Veterans of Combat Service and Other Matters

Sec. 111. Expansion of period of eligibility for health care for certain veterans of combat service.

TITLE II—TOXIC EXPOSURE PRESUMPTION PROCESS

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Improvements to ability of Department of Veterans Affairs to establish presumptions of service connection based on toxic exposure.

Sec. 203. Outreach to claimants for disability compensation pursuant to changes in presumptions of service connection.

Sec. 204. Reevaluation of claims for dependency and indemnity compensation involving presumptions of service connection.

TITLE III—IMPROVING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SERVICE CONNECTION PROCESS FOR TOXIC-EXPOSED VETERANS

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Presumptions of toxic exposure.

Sec. 303. Medical nexus examinations for toxic exposure risk activities.

TITLE IV—PRESUMPTIONS OF SERVICE CONNECTION

Sec. 401. Treatment of veterans who participated in cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation-exposed veterans for purposes of presumption of service connection of certain disabilities by Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 402. Treatment of veterans who participated in nuclear response near Palomares, Spain, or Thule, Greenland, as radiation-exposed veterans for purposes of presumption of service connection of certain disabilities by Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 403. Presumptions of service connection for diseases associated with exposures to certain herbicide agents for veterans who served in certain locations.

Sec. 404. Addition of additional diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in certain locations.

Sec. 405. Improving compensation for disabilities occurring in Persian Gulf War veterans.

Sec. 406. Presumption of service connection for certain diseases associated with exposure to burn pits and other toxins.

Sec. 407. Rule of construction.

TITLE V—RESEARCH MATTERS

Sec. 501. Interagency working group on toxic exposure research.

Sec. 502. Analysis and report on treatment of veterans for medical conditions related to toxic exposure.

Sec. 503. Analysis relating to mortality of veterans who served in Southwest Asia.

Sec. 504. Study on health trends of post-9/11 veterans.

Sec. 505. Study on cancer rates among veterans.

Sec. 506. Study on health effects of waste related to Manhattan Project on certain veterans.