



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

No. 153

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Holy God, we know that You desire to set Your truth deep in our spirits, and we ask that You come to the hidden places of our hearts. Deepen Your truth in our souls. Speak to us there and teach us wisdom.

Create in us clean hearts. Fill our minds with pure thoughts and holy desires. Then may we be found ready and willing to do the work You put before us.

Delight in us today. May the words of our mouths, the thoughts in our heads, and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable to You.

For Your pleasure is not to be found in our performance. Our sacrifice of time and service do not impress You. But You desire a contrite heart, a yielding spirit, a kind word, and a gracious attitude.

Lord, unlock our hearts and open our lips that from them will pour out thankfulness and praise. Then may our joy be a blessing to those whom we encounter this day.

In Your gracious name, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the Chamber her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, BREAK THE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5768, VIOLENT INCIDENT CLEARANCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIVE METHODS ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6448, INVEST TO PROTECT ACT OF 2022; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8542, MENTAL HEALTH JUSTICE ACT OF 2022

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1377

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4118) to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5768) to direct the Attorney Gen-

eral to establish a grant program to establish, create, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-62, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6448) to direct the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice to carry out a grant program to provide assistance to police departments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-65 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8542) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and political subdivisions thereof to hire, employ, train, and dispatch mental health professionals to respond

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H8069

in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving one or more persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DEMINGS). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1377, providing for consideration of four measures: H.R. 4118, H.R. 6448; H.R. 5768, and H.R. 8542, all under closed rules.

For H.R. 4118 and H.R. 6448, the rule provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary for each bill and motions to recommit for each measure.

For H.R. 5768, the rule provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER, and provides a motion to recommit.

For H.R. 8542, the bill provides 30 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, Democrats in this Congress have been focused on building safer communities since day one. We believe that every child in America deserves the safety and security of growing up in a community free from violence, trusting that the people who keep them safe will do that regardless of the color of their skin or the ZIP Code that they live in. We believe that the need to fight crime and improve safety in our communities should unite us, not divide us.

These are good bills that we are considering today that will make our communities safer.

The Mental Health Justice Act creates a grant program for States and local governments to train and dispatch mental health professionals to respond to emergencies that involve people with behavioral needs.

The VICTIM Act establishes a grant program to hire, train, and retain detectives and victim services personnel to investigate shootings and support victims.

The Break the Cycle of Violence Act provides grants to communities for evidence-based community violence intervention and prevention programs designed to interrupt cycles of violence.

The Invest to Protect Act creates a grant program to provide police departments of fewer than 125 officers training resources for calls involving people with substance use disorders, mental health needs, and for people with disabilities.

I am glad that we are moving forward today. I am thankful to my colleagues who have worked on these bills.

Do I want more?

Of course.

Will I keep fighting for us to do more?

Absolutely.

The truth is we still haven't made meaningful gains when it comes to accountability. The House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Sadly, the Senate is yet to act on that bill.

But I don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good, and if you don't like what is in one of these bills or all of them, then you can vote against them. But I strongly urge everybody on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on the rule so we can at least move this forward and have the opportunity to debate these measures.

I am confident that many of the provisions of these four bills will help save lives. But this conversation can't end here. We need to keep making our communities safer in new, innovative, and imaginative ways. We can start by passing this rule and passing the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I thank the Representative and my colleague on the Rules Committee from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this morning we are here to debate a rule providing for a series of bills that have been noticed multiple times going back as far as July. But we in the Rules Committee were given 1 hour to consider the changes that have been negotiated—negotiated internally—within the majority conference with no minority input. Presumably, the changes were made at the behest of the leftwing defund-the-police activists who, unfortunately, have become the loudest voice in their party.

It seems to me that these bills are a very transparent response to the nega-

tive reaction Democrats have experienced as a result of these continued calls while crime is understandably skyrocketing.

The VICTIM Act creates a new Federal grant program to help local governments cut down on homicide and nonfatal shooting backlogs. The funds can be used for hiring and training detectives and processing personnel, upgrading or replacing investigative or evidence-processing technology, and improving resources for victims and their families.

First of all, these programs largely replicate existing programs managed by the Department of Justice. This, again, reminds us of why we have been called to this debate. It is not to solve a problem. It is so that my Democrat colleagues can look like they are solving problems. Furthermore, programs like this would not be needed if the left had not prioritized defunding the police over keeping our country's citizens safe.

This bill effectively bails out governments like Austin, Philadelphia, and Rochester, New York, that decreased police budgets over the years.

The Invest to Protect Act expands COPS grant programs to include police departments with fewer than 125 law enforcement officers. Funds may be used for training, body cameras, signing and retention bonuses, and providing access to mental health services.

Just to point out, there is a clause in this bill that explicitly says that the Attorney General can give preference to activities that have nothing to do with recruitment or retention.

Madam Speaker, the left has been actively fighting against law enforcement, and, as a result, the American people are angry. They are angry about the increases in violent crimes across the country, and they are angry about repeat offenders being released to commit even more serious crimes.

□ 0915

They are angry that even after making these concerns clear, Democrats have been ignoring them in favor of an extreme anti-police agenda. This is a last-ditch effort for them to act like they are not deeply out of touch with the country, coming just in time to see the results from election polling.

This is an effort to sweep under the rug that my colleagues in the majority will seek private security while simultaneously seeking cuts to police budgets. My colleagues in the majority want to distract from the statements of their Members that apparently defunding the police is only one step toward fully dismantling police departments.

My colleagues want to distract from the fact that even some of the most senior officials of the Biden administration are echoing or applauding efforts to reduce budgets of law enforcement. Despite this hollow effort, I am confident the American people see

right through this charade and view this for what it is, a political exercise.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, I ask Members to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for my colleague from Minnesota and appreciate serving with her on the Rules Committee, but I think the only talk about politics here is from the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

She talks about defunding the police. The bills that are before us are grant programs. So I am not sure what she is talking about. If you want to talk about politics, fine, let's talk about voting records.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Washington Post article titled "21 House Republicans vote against awarding Congressional Gold Medal to all police officers who responded on January 6."

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 2022]

21 HOUSE REPUBLICANS VOTE AGAINST AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ALL POLICE OFFICERS WHO RESPONDED ON JAN. 6
(By Felicia Sonmez)

Twenty-one House Republicans on Tuesday voted against awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to all police officers who responded to the Jan. 6 violent attack on the Capitol by a pro-Trump mob.

The measure passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support from 406 lawmakers. But the 21 Republicans who voted "no" drew immediate condemnation from some of their colleagues, and the vote underscored the lingering tensions in Congress amid efforts by some GOP lawmakers to whitewash the events of that day.

Rep. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott (D-Va.) called the "no" votes "a sad commentary on the @HouseGOP," while Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-Ill.) declared, "How you can vote no to this is beyond me."

"Then again, denying an insurrection is as well," Kinzinger, a vocal critic of former president Donald Trump, said in a tweet. "To the brave Capitol (and DC metro PD) thank you. To the 21: they will continue to defend your right to vote no anyway."

In an interview on CNN Tuesday night, Rep. Gerald E. Connolly (D-Va.) called the 21 "no" votes "a new low for this crowd."

"They voted to overturn an election. But in their vote today, they kind of sealed the deal of basically affiliating with the mob," Connolly said. "They now are part of the insurrectionist mob. They brought enormous disrepute and dishonor on themselves in not honoring the brave men and women who defended the Capitol of the United States—everybody in it, but also defending the symbol of democracy in the world, not just here in the United States."

In March, when an initial version of the legislation was brought to the House floor, a dozen Republicans voted against the measure. Many of those who voted "no" said they objected to the use of the term "insurrectionists" in the resolution.

Those GOP lawmakers included Reps. Andy Biggs (Ariz.), Thomas Massie (Ky.), Andy Harris (Md.), Lance Gooden (Tex.), Matt Gaetz (Fla.), Marjorie Taylor Greene (Ga.), Louie Gohmert (Tex.), Michael Cloud (Tex.), Andrew S. Clyde (Ga.), Greg Steube (Fla.), Bob Good (Va.) and John Rose (Tenn.).

The House and Senate then remained in a standoff for three months over whether to

honor all law enforcement who responded on Jan. 6 or to award the Congressional Gold Medal to one officer in particular, Capitol Police Officer Eugene Goodman, who single-handedly diverted an angry mob away from the Senate chamber.

The Senate had already unanimously voted to give the Gold Medal exclusively to Goodman. The medal, bestowed by Congress, is a symbol of national appreciation for distinguished achievements.

Ultimately, both chambers agreed to slightly modify the House legislation. Four Gold Medals will be awarded: one for the Capitol Police, one for the D.C. police, another for the Smithsonian Institution and another to be displayed inside the Capitol building along with a plaque that names all law enforcement agencies who helped repel the rioters that day.

On Tuesday, Gooden, one of the 12 House Republicans who voted against the legislation in March, voted in favor of the new bill.

But the number of opposing votes grew, with 10 other House Republicans switching their votes from "yes" to "no."

Those Republicans are Reps. Lauren Boebert (Colo.), Barry Moore (Ala.), Ralph Norman (S.C.), Matthew M. Rosendale (Mont.), Chip Roy (Tex.), Paul A. Gosar (Ariz.), Warren Davidson (Ohio), Scott Perry (Pa.), Jody Hice (Ga.) and Mary Miller (Ill.).

Some of those who voted "no" on Tuesday said they objected to the use of the words "temple" or "insurrection" in the resolution.

"I wouldn't call it an insurrection," Greene said, according to Politico.

Some House Republicans, such as Clyde, have sought to recast the violent mob's actions on Jan. 6 as little different from a "normal tourist visit" to the Capitol. Others have sought to play down that day's events in different ways.

During the storming of the Capitol on Jan. 6, rioters attempted to break into the House chamber, punching and busting glass, resulting in the death of Ashli Babbitt, whom police shot when she attempted to climb through a shattered glass door.

Gosar has previously claimed that Babbitt had been "executed"—even though she defied police warnings and the officer who fatally shot her was cleared of any criminal wrongdoing.

Gosar did so again Tuesday, claiming during a House hearing that a Capitol Police officer was "lying in wait" for Babbitt and that she was "executed," Politico reported.

Rep. Liz Cheney (R-Wyo.), who was ousted from House Republican leadership over her criticism of Trump's role in the Jan. 6 insurrection, denounced Gosar's remarks Tuesday evening.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, you heard that right: 21 of our colleagues across the aisle opposed a simple bill honoring the heroes of January 6; officers who now bear physical and psychological scars from that day because they fought to protect us in the Capitol. It is disgraceful. Yet, nothing about that from the other side of the aisle in terms of just how disgraceful that was.

You can talk politics, but if you want to talk about the substance of these bills, then do so and acknowledge what they are. They are bills that will help make our community safer. They are bills that, quite frankly—I should also point out that I think all but one of the bills is the same as they were in July.

I am not quite sure what the fuss over the fact that we are bringing

these things up right now is all about. They are good bills that will help make our community safer. Look, I trust that we pass the rule. Some thoughtful Republicans will vote in favor of some of them or all of them.

If you don't believe that this is an appropriate thing to do, then you can vote "no." That is your right, and you can go home and explain it to your constituents.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I believe it is two bills that are different, but we can check on that just to make sure that we understand what is going on.

To further illustrate the political charade, my colleagues in the majority have blocked any effort to include thoughtful policy solutions proposed by House Republicans.

In the Rules Committee, I even offered a motion to consider a bill I proposed earlier this year to support our law enforcement's efforts to train our next generation of peace officers. H.R. 7421, the Law Enforcement Education Grant Program Act of 2022, was a product of discussions with Minnesota State patrol officers and other members of the local community regarding the difficulty of not only hiring new officers but even finding potential recruits.

Police departments across the country are experiencing a serious shortage of officers. This lack of qualified officers has led to a drastic increase in crime. We need to invest in recruiting a number of well-trained and highly educated police officers to help keep our communities safe.

This bill provides education grants of up to \$4,000 per year, not exceeding \$16,000 total, to a student who is pursuing their first degree in a law enforcement or criminal justice-related field. As a requirement of receiving the grant, the applicant must commit to serving as a full-time law enforcement officer for 4 years within an 8-year period of completing their studies.

In order to instill integrity of the program and prevent abuse, if an applicant fails to complete their service requirements, the grants will be converted back into a loan and the applicant will be required to pay it back.

In order to ensure flexibility over what education program best fits the student, the grants are distributed directly to candidates, not educational institutions. In addition, the curriculum at an institution must have been approved by the State's Police Officer Standard and Training Board, or the related State agency.

Finally, there are exemptions from the clawback bill for officers who are injured in the line of duty and cannot serve out their 4-year requirement. These are the types of solutions that the majority refuses to even debate or bring forward under this rule. It further supports my argument that this is

simply political theatre, covering up for years of dangerous and irresponsible rhetoric that has put law enforcement in harm's way time and time again.

I would just like to add that there are many, many good and positive Republican proposals out there that the majority refuses to even consider in committee, and this is just one example of those.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, just for the record, because I think it is important to have an accurate record, the text of three of these bills has been available for over a month. Even the manager's amendment on the VICTIM Act of 2022, which the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) has introduced has been available for almost a month.

Again, the only one talking about politics is the gentlewoman from Minnesota, but I guess that is all they have.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of the VICTIM Act of 2022 from the National Association of Police Organizations, from the National Fraternal Order of Police, from the International Association of Chiefs of Police, from the National Police Foundation, all in support of the VICTIM Act.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, June 14, 2022.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), representing over 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers across the United States, I am writing to advise you of our support for the Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods (VICTIM) Act, H.R. 5768, and thank the Committee for considering this legislation.

Our nation's cities and communities are experiencing a historic rise in violent crime. Murders and non-fatal shootings are going unresolved at higher rates as law enforcement agencies do not have the officers and resources to dedicate to improving clearance rates for these horrendous crimes. The VICTIM Act will help address this issue by supplying much needed grant funding to agencies to fill, replenish, train, and support their detective and homicide personnel. Through this legislation, law enforcement will be able to focus on solving these violent crimes that have such a detrimental impact on our communities and improve the services that they render to victims.

We urge the Committee to join us in support of the VICTIM Act and we look forward to working with you to ensure law enforcement agencies have the support and resources necessary to serve and protect our communities.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, Esq.,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington DC, 13 June 2022.

Hon. JERROLD L. NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES D. JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES NADLER AND JORDAN: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.R. 5768, the "Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods (VICTIM) Act" and H.R. 6528, the "Active Shooter Alert Act" and to urge the Committee to favorably report these bills.

In 2020, the United States saw the largest rise in homicides since the start of national record-keeping in 1960. Approximately 21,570 people were murdered in the United States in 2020—the most since 1995—and a 29.4 percent increase over 2019. Additionally, the FBI estimates that 77 percent of all murders in the United States in 2020 were via firearms, up from 73 percent in 2019. At the same time that the murder rate rose, the clearance rate for murders fell significantly, from 61.4 percent in 2019 to 54.4 percent in 2020. In cities with a population above 250,000, the rate was even more dramatic, falling from 57.6 percent in 2019 to 47.3 percent in 2020.

Homicide cases can be very difficult to clear—especially those committed via a firearm—and non-fatal shootings even more so. Closing these types of crimes requires diligence, manpower, and a sustained investigative effort. Given the limited resources of law enforcement agencies, it's important to provide the significant, dedicated resources that clearing these crimes requires, especially given their oftentimes heinous nature.

The VICTIM Act would establish a grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to help State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies improve their clearance rates for homicides and non-fatal shootings. Agencies can use these grant funds to train or hire additional detectives, investigators, or other police personnel that can investigate, solve, and respond to homicides and non-fatal shootings. The grants can also be used to improve training for agency personnel to address the needs of victims and family members of homicides and non-fatal shootings.

These important resources would improve law enforcement agencies' abilities to close homicide cases, which would punish the perpetrators of these crimes, provide justice for the victims and their families, and grant peace of mind for communities and the dedicated law enforcement officers that serve them.

Active shooter events, however, are not like normal firearms homicides cases. Rather than focusing on investigative methods after the fact, these kinds of events place a premium on the abilities of law enforcement to quickly react to a fluid and oftentimes unclear situation. Responding to an active shooter event is chaotic and can be fraught with peril, especially when the incident is not confined to one location. Law enforcement officers must prioritize preserving lives and ending the threat. Simultaneously, they need a way to notify the public about the incident, whether that is to avoid a certain area, shelter in place, or announce when the area is once again safe. The "Active Shooter Alert Act" is designed to improve the ways officers and agencies communicate with the public about active threats.

The bill would establish a national coordinator within the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to set up and administer an Active Shooter Alert Communications Network.

The Active Shooter Alert Coordinator, in coordination with other Federal components like the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), would develop best practices and training on the use of a secure communications system during an active shooter event. We believe as you all do—having a network for informing the public during these critical incidents will save lives.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I am proud to offer our support for these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CHIEFS OF POLICE,
Alexandria, VA, June 14, 2022.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: On behalf of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 5768, the Violent Incident Clearance and Technological Investigative Methods Act of 2021" (VICTIM Act). By providing dedicated resources to law enforcement agencies to enhance their abilities to successfully investigate violent criminal acts, the VICTIM Act will bring justice to victims, remove violent offenders from our communities and bring closure to families.

Specifically, the VICTIM Act would, through a newly established a Department of Justice grant program, provide state, tribal and local law enforcement agencies with much needed resources to assist them in enhancing their investigatory capabilities. This includes allowing agencies to:

- hire and retain detectives to investigate homicide and non-fatal shootings;
- acquire resources for processing evidence, including the hiring of additional personnel;
- hire personnel trained to analyze criminal intelligence and crime trends;
- ensure victim services are sufficiently staffed, funded, and trained.

The IACP urges the Judiciary Committee and the members of the United States House of Representative to support and approve H.R. 5768.

Sincerely,

CHIEF DWIGHT E. HENNINGER,
IACP President.

NATIONAL POLICE FOUNDATION,
February 18, 2022.

Hon. VAL DEMINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. DEMINGS: I write on behalf of the National Police Foundation to enthusiastically support H.R. 5768, the VICTIM Act. The National Police Foundation is an independent and nonpartisan organization dedicated to advancing policing through innovation and science.

Many communities across America are dealing with increases in crime or concerns over their continued safety. In many places, violent crime and shootings have increased exponentially.

The grants authorized in the VICTIM Act will help law enforcement agencies overcome some of the challenges associated with responding to the current increase in violent crime. More specifically, this bill will provide law enforcement with critical resources

to address staffing challenges, enhance their forensics capabilities, further deploy investigative technologies, and provide services to victims of violent crime and their families.

Thank you for your continued leadership and support for America's law enforcement officers and all the people they serve. We look forward to seeing this bill become law and the resources getting into the hands of law enforcement where they are so critically needed. We commend you and the other sponsors for your commitment to funding the police and giving them the tools they need to protect and serve.

Sincerely,

JIM BURCH,
President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to my colleague that they are supporting this legislation not because of politics, they are supporting it because they think it is actually good for our communities and will make our communities safer.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Forbes article titled "Trump Loyalists' Calls To Defund the FBI, and Other Hypocrisies."

[From Forbes, Aug. 12, 2022]

TRUMP LOYALISTS' CALLS TO DEFUND THE
FBI, AND OTHER HYPOCRISIES

(By Shaun Harper)

Federal Bureau of Investigation agents executed a warrant to search former U.S. President Donald Trump's Mar-a-Lago estate in Palm Beach, Florida this week. They were reportedly looking for classified documents that weren't supposed to leave the White House during the presidential transition. Materials for which the FBI was looking apparently have national security implications. In a press conference yesterday, Attorney General Merrick Garland said he "personally approved" the search of Trump's home.

Shockingly and ironically, many Trump loyalists are calling for the FBI to be defunded.

Following the police-executed murders of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor in 2020, Black Lives Matter activists and other Americans called for a defunding of police departments across the country. Trump, most of his supporters, and several others fiercely rejected this proposal. They praised law enforcement officers and advanced what became known as the "Blue Lives Matter" campaign. There was occasional acknowledgment that a small number of bad apples sometimes engage in bad behaviors. But systemic racism in policing? Absolutely not. Opponents of the defund the police movement loudly applauded the bravery, sacrifice, and integrity of law enforcement officers.

Trump supporters who opposed defunding the police two years ago are now calling for the FBI, a law enforcement agency, to be defunded. Among them is Florida Republican congressional candidate Anthony Sabatini, who in a CNN interview deemed the FBI "totally useless." He also wants FBI agents to be arrested.

Garland, our nation's top cop, "needs to be assassinated," one person who may (or may not) be a Trump supporter tweeted. This is just one of many social media posts this week calling for violence against the Attorney General and the FBI. Ricky Shiffer, an armed man who allegedly fired into an FBI office building with a nail gun and was armed with an AR-15-style rifle, was killed following a car chase and standoff with law enforcement officers in Cincinnati yesterday. Shiffer was allegedly part of pro-Trump

extremist groups that attacked the U.S. Capitol last year.

The hypocrisy over opposing defunding the police in 2020, but calling for the FBI to be defunded now, is clear—though not at all atypical. Trump loyalists have done versions of this before.

"Lock her up," they chanted, as 2016 Democratic Presidential nominee Hillary Clinton was accused of storing classified information on private, unencrypted email servers in her home. Paradoxically, a version of this is why FBI agents searched Trump's Florida estate this week.

The same group that reached determinations of Clinton's guilt before, during, and after the investigation of her swiftly determined that the FBI is wrong about Trump and should therefore be defunded.

Another example are the "My Body, My Choice" posters that many Trump supporters carried during rallies held throughout the pandemic to oppose masking and vaccine mandates. That phrase had been long used in pro-choice demonstrations. Most Trump supporters aren't pro-choice, right?

The opposition of President Barack Obama nominating Merrick Garland for the Supreme Court seat that became vacant eight months prior to the 2016 election is a third example of hypocrisy. Trump supporters and other GOP members successfully argued that an outgoing president shouldn't have the authority to nominate a new justice to the Court with so little time remaining in his tenure. Yet, many of those same politicians and other conservatives were fully on board with Trump nominating Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court just 38 days before the 2020 presidential election.

And then there is the racialized double standard that played out in the January 6 Capitol Insurrection. On June 1, 2020, a group of mostly peaceful demonstrators gathered near the White House to protest George Floyd's murder. They killed no one and did no damage to the White House or any other federal building. But Trump still called in the National Guard to aggressively remove them from the streets. His supporters defended the president's decision. Just six months later, hundreds of angry Trump loyalists, most of them white, violently attacked the U.S. Capitol. Their actions resulted in five deaths and the injuries of 140 law enforcement officers.

The inescapably obvious role that race played in the January 6 insurrection hasn't been talked about much, if at all, in the recent congressional hearings. Had Black Americans attacked the Capitol, I am certain that Trump supporters, as well as other conservatives and liberals alike, would have reached near-unanimous agreement on what happened that day and the necessary legal repercussions. I also remain convinced that most Black protestors would have been immediately killed had they scaled and otherwise violently entered any federal building, let alone the one in which Vice President Mike Pence and congresspersons were meeting at the time. Trump and his loyalists surely would've argued those Black insurrectionists deserved whatever law enforcement officers did to them that day, hence the hypocrisy.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I remind my Republican colleagues that just last month a number of them openly and unabashedly messaged around defunding and dismantling the FBI. Some even sold campaign merchandise with that tagline. Let that sink in, I would say to my colleagues.

In any event, pass the rule. Let's have the debate on these bills. If you

want to promote safer communities, then you will support them. If you want to just do politics as usual, then you will follow the lead of my colleague from Minnesota and vote against them.

Madam Speaker, these are good bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts says, oh, these were available; these were available for over a month.

Then my question would be: Then why the emergency meeting yesterday? Why, with an hour's notice, the Rules Committee is called together to push these bills through, other than some kind of political charade to get these bills to the floor today at 9 o'clock in the morning with very little notice?

It seems to me that as much as he says there are no changes, and that they have been available, still, an emergency meeting with an hour's notice at 3:25 in the afternoon yesterday, it seems like they are pushing things through without the notice that the American people and the Members of Congress deserve.

Our Nation's law enforcement officers put on a badge every day and bravely put themselves in harm's way to keep our communities safe. The past few years have been especially dangerous for America's police as a direct result of the Democrat-led defund the police movement, and their soft-on-crime policies.

Cities across the country have suffered a dramatic increase in crime. Carjacking and smash-and-grab robberies are now common. Last year, major cities broke their annual homicide records. The national rise in crime has devastating costs for the communities and, also, for local police.

In California, Kern County Deputy Sheriff Phillip Campas was killed in the line of duty after his SWAT team responded to a domestic violence call. He was a marine veteran and a dedicated father whose legacy of heroism will never be forgotten.

In New York, New York City Police Officer Vogel was seen running through Times Square toward an ambulance after saving a 4-year-old girl who had been struck by a stray bullet. The officer's bravery and quick thinking made all the difference in getting the girl to safety.

In Alabama, Wilcox County Constable Madison Nicholson, who had protected his community for over 40 years, was shot and killed in the line of duty when he and a sheriff's deputy were responding to a domestic disturbance.

Our police are under attack like never before. According to the FBI, more police officers were murdered in the line of duty during President Biden's first year in office than in any year since 1995. Many of them were killed in ambush-style or unprovoked attacks.

Not only have calls to defund, dismantle, or abolish the police that come from the activists, or even within the Halls of Congress, have created a more treacherous climate for officers, but it has also negatively impacted morale among the police.

Nationwide, law enforcement agencies are short 7 percent of filling budgeted positions, and retirements are up 45 percent. Law enforcement is our essential line of defense in maintaining law and order. They deserve America's and Congress' full support.

House Republicans are grateful to our law enforcement officers for their service to our communities and understand the incredible commitment they make in choosing to wear the uniform. We will always stand with our men and women in blue and their families.

House Democrats would like to use these bills to convince the American people of the same, but Americans know and understand.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for conceding that the text of three of the bills was available for a month. I am glad we could set the record straight on that.

The second thing I will say is that at least two of these bills have bipartisan cosponsorship. The VICTIM Act has four Republican cosponsors. The Invest to Protect Act has 24 Republican cosponsors. Maybe they didn't get the memo that they are supposed to put politics ahead of people, but the bottom line is they are cosponsors of this. I would expect, unless their arms are twisted, that they will vote for the bills on final passage.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 101 human rights, civil rights, racial justice, religiously affiliated, and gun safety organizations who wrote in support of Congressman HORSFORD's bill, H.R. 4118, the Break the Cycle of Violence Act. I think that is worth noting.

JULY 30, 2021.

We the undersigned 101 human rights, civil rights, racial justice, religiously affiliated and gun safety organizations write in support of the Break the Cycle of Violence Act (S. 2275/H.R. 4118). We urge you to swiftly pass the Break the Cycle of Violence Act to provide at least \$5 billion in federal funding over eight years for community gun violence prevention programs.

Gun violence in the U.S. is a crisis, disproportionately impacting Black and Brown communities nationwide. Gun homicides are the leading cause of death among Black men ages 15-34 and the second-leading cause of death for Latino men and boys of the same age range. Black men are more than ten times as likely to be the victims of gun homicides than white men. In 2019, 14,414 people died from gun homicides in the U.S. Nearly 60 percent—8,607—of gun homicide deaths were Black people. Yet Black people represent just 14.7 percent of the U.S. population.

With a surge in gun sales in the wake of COVID-19, shootings are increasing across

the U.S., contributing to the crisis. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were 39,707 deaths in 2019, the most recent year for which government data is available with 14,414 of those being gun homicides. The Gun Violence Archive, a non-profit organization that tracks and documents gun injuries and deaths, published data in May 2021 indicating that the number of deaths in 2020 had risen to a staggering 43,554 with 19,398 of those being gun homicides.

Evidence-based, community violence prevention programs have been proven to reduce gun violence and save lives, while investing resources in impacted communities. There are three well-established models of gun violence prevention programs that have proven successful in reducing violence, some of which are referenced in both President Biden's executive actions and guidance and in the Break the Cycle of Violence Act. The Group Violence Intervention ("GVI") strategy, a form of problem-oriented policing (as opposed to traditional "incident-driven" policing), was first used in the enormously successful Operation Ceasefire in Boston in the mid-1990s where it was associated with a 61 percent reduction in youth homicide. The program has now been implemented in a wide variety of cities with consistently impressive results. An analysis of more than 20 GVI programs showed a significant reduction in firearm violence. The most successful of these programs have reduced violent crime in cities by an average of 30 percent and improved relations between law enforcement officers and the neighborhoods they serve. The GVI model has a remarkably strong track record: a documented association with homicide reductions of 30 to 60 percent.

A study of the Cure Violence model, first implemented in Chicago, found that its implementation in several targeted districts in Chicago was associated with a 38 percent greater decrease in homicides and a 15 percent greater decrease in shootings, compared to districts that did not receive the intervention. A 2018 evaluation of Philadelphia's Cure Violence Program found that shootings decreased significantly, compared to other matched comparison areas.

An example of Hospital Based Violence Intervention, the third model of evidence-based violence prevention programs, is the San Francisco Wraparound Project, first introduced in 2005. In its first six years of operation the Wraparound Project was associated with a fourfold decrease in injury recidivism (re-injury from gun-shot wounds) rates. Moreover, studies have shown that this form of intervention saves hospitals money by preventing future injuries, both for the patient and for anyone the patient may have considered retaliating against.

Investment, training, and support for culturally appropriate violence prevention workers with lived experience in impacted communities has proven successful in cities across the U.S., yet lack of political will has resulted in many advocates and community leaders working with limited or no resources.

For example, Lamar Johnson of B.R.A.V.E. Chicago, said: "Our after-school program is a non-profit—we run it through the church—and the funding comes mostly from private donors. The majority of the city's budget goes to law enforcement—and that's not just Chicago, that's most cities. We've met with mayors' administrations so many times and presented our case, but they don't give us funding. The whole system is so broken, because the focus is on the criminal justice system. If someone is addicted to drugs, they go to jail before they go to the hospital to get treatment. It's the mindset."

Recognizing the effectiveness of these programs and the heroic people like Lamar who

lead them, President Biden, on March 31, 2021, announced his intention to include \$5 billion for gun violence prevention programs in the American Jobs Plan. This builds on the efforts of Senator Booker and Representative Horsford to pass the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, first introduced in the 116th Congress. If passed, it would provide funding for federal grants to communities that experience 20 or more homicides per year and have a homicide rate at least twice the national average, or communities that demonstrate a unique and compelling need for additional resources to address gun and group-related violence. Each grant awarded would be renewable over five years, and funds would be commensurate with the scope of the proposal and the demonstrated need.

While it is impossible to place a dollar amount on a person's life or the cost of that loss to their families, communities, and loved ones, the astronomical financial impact of gun violence on U.S. society cannot be overlooked. According to a 2020 study by physicians and researchers, gun violence costs the U.S. healthcare system \$170 billion per year. The Health Alliance for Violence Intervention estimates it would cost an estimated \$827 million per year, or \$5.36 billion over eight years, to fund sustained and adequate violence intervention programs in the 48 U.S. cities with the highest rates of violence—hence the call on Congress to pass at least \$5 billion over eight years for community gun violence prevention programs.

With sustained investment into gun violence prevention programs and a national comprehensive strategy aimed at reducing gun violence, particularly in Black and Brown communities, Congress can make inroads to reducing gun violence in all communities and ensure the right of everyone to live free from the threat of gun violence. Congress has an obligation to take action to invest in communities ravaged by gun violence and to make efforts to prevent gun violence and protect the lives and safety of all individuals, particularly in the face of evidence that the 2020 gun-related injury and death tolls in the U.S. have been the highest in decades.

We urge Congress to act urgently to pass the Break the Cycle of Violence Act to ensure at least \$5 billion in federal funding over eight years for community gun violence prevention programs that save lives.

Sincerely,

Amnesty International USA, Community Justice Action Fund, ACLU, African American Ministers in Action, Ban Assault Weapons Now!, Brady, BRAVE Youth Leaders, Ceasefire Oregon, Ceasefire Pennsylvania, Center for American Progress, The Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, CommonSpirit Health, Congregation of Sisters of St. Agnes and the CSA-USA Associate Community Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace, CT Against Gun Violence.

Dominican Sisters of Houston, Dominican Sisters—Grand Rapids, Dominican Sisters of Sinsinawa, Everytown for Gun Safety, First Unitarian Universalist Church of Houston, Franciscan Action Network, Franciscan Peace Center, Franciscan Sisters of the Sacred Heart, Generation Progress, Giffords, GPEC-ICHV, Grandmothers Against Gun Violence, Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart, Gun Violence Prevention PAC Illinois, The Health Alliance for Violence Intervention, Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters, USA-JPIC.

Honor with Action Coalition, Houston League of Business & Professional Women, IHM Sisters—Justice, Peace and Sustainability Office, Indivisible Northern Nevada, Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Intercommunity Peace and Justice Center, Iowans for Gun Safety, Jewish Women International, www.Journey4ward.org, Leadership

Conference of Women Religious, Leadership Team of the Pelican Sisters of North America, March for Our Lives DC, Marylanders to Prevent Gun Violence, Massachusetts Coalition to Prevent Gun Violence, Moms Demand Action.

NAACP, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Newtown Action Alliance, Newtown Junior Action Alliance, Non-violence Institute of Rhode Island, North Carolina Council of Churches, North Carolinians Against Gun Violence, Northwest Coalition for Responsible Investment, Not My Generation, Ohio Coalition Against Gun Violence, People for a Safer Society, Presentation Sisters, San Francisco, CA, Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association, Region VI Coalition for Responsible Investment, Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, Western American Area.

Restorations Ministries, Inc., Rhode Island Coalition Against Gun Violence, Sacred Ground Ministries, Saint Mark's Episcopal Capitol Hill DC, San Diegans for Gun Violence Prevention, Sandy Hook Promise, School Sisters of Notre Dame-Atlantic Midwest Office, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Central Pacific Province, Sisters of Bon Secours, USA, Sisters of Charity, BVM, Sisters of Charity Federation, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Congregational Leadership, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Western Province Leadership, Sisters of Charity of Saint Augustine, Sisters of Mercy of the American Justice Team.

Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur USA, Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt, New York, Sisters of St. Dominic Racine, WI, Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston, Sisters of Saint Joseph of Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, PA, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, LA, Sisters of St. Joseph of NW PA, Sisters of St. Mary of Namur, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of the Humility of Mary, Squirrel Hill Stands Against Gun Violence, Stop Handgun Violence, Students Demand Action, Survivors Lead.

Team Enough, Trinity Health, Union of Sisters of the Presentation of BVM, USA Unit, United Church of Christ, Justice and Local Church Ministries, Ursuline Sisters of Cleveland, Ursuline Sisters of Louisville, KY, Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph, Wheaton Franciscans JPIC Office, Youth Advocate Programs, Inc., Youth Over Guns.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again I inserted earlier an article talking about the Republicans that would not even honor the men and women of the Capitol Police who defended us on January 6. I continue to believe that that was a disgraceful moment.

But when the gentlewoman says that somehow they will always stand on behalf and honor members of law enforcement—let me just read a few quotations here. Representative JEFF DUNCAN from South Carolina:

“The FBI has proven time and again that it is corrupt to the core. At what point do we abolish the Bureau and start over?”

Representative PAUL GOSAR of Arizona says:

“I will support a complete dismantling and elimination of the Democrat brownshirts known as the FBI. This is too much for our Republic to withstand.”

Representative LAUREN BOEBERT of Colorado:

“The GOP majority must defund all forms of tyranny throughout Biden's government. @FBI.”

Representative MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE of Georgia:

“Impeach Merrick Garland and defund the corrupt FBI. End political persecution and hold those accountable that abuse their positions of power to persecute their political enemies, while ruining our country. This shouldn't happen in America. Republicans must force it to stop.”

□ 0930

On MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE's website, she is selling defund the FBI T-shirts, so it is my friends on the other side of the aisle who want to defund law enforcement, who want to defund the police.

There is an old saying: Physician, heal thyself. You ought to take that to heart. The bottom line here is that these are bills that will help improve safety in our communities. These are bills that local officials, local law enforcement organizations, want. The only people who don't want them are my friends on the other side of the aisle.

If you want to vote no, vote no. But I suspect that some on the minority side understand what their communities want, and they don't want politics as usual. They don't want people putting politics over people. What they want is help for their communities.

You have a chance. You can either vote yes to help the communities or vote no. That is your choice.

Madam Speaker, I think these bills are good bills. We should support the rule. We should support the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Madam Speaker, for years now, progressives in the media have disparaged law enforcement at every opportunity, from the defund the police movement to agenda-driven liberal district attorneys in cities like San Francisco, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and New York. There is a clear strategic effort on the part of Democrats to demean police officers nationwide at the expense of law and order.

In 2021, according to the Fraternal Order of Police, 346 officers were shot, 63 fatally. Additionally, there were 103 ambush-style attacks on law enforcement, a 115 percent increase from 2020.

Even as members of the Democratic Party are victims of increasing crimes, they are unwavering in their aggression on those in uniform who stand on the front lines and every day protect and serve our communities. Rather than acknowledging and thanking these brave men and women, Democrats have repeatedly gone out of their way to put the blame on those in uniform.

They may claim otherwise, but here are the words straight from their

mouths. If we need to make sure that we are quoting people today, I am more than willing to do that.

“... Police in our country are more concerned with protecting white supremacy than serving the communities that pay their salaries.”—Representative BOWMAN.

“Defunding the police isn't radical. It is real.”—Representative CORI BUSH.

“The truth is that abolishing ICE isn't that radical. We reorganize government all the time, creating some agencies and eliminating others. Nevertheless, it is a bold proposal. It is time to be bold. It is time to abolish ICE.”—Representative MARK POCAN.

“The defund the police movement is one of reimagining the current police system to build an entity that does not violate us, while relocating funds to invest in community services.”—Representative ILHAN OMAR.

“Defunding police means defunding police.”—Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ.

“We are spending too much money on the police. There should be substantial cuts to the police budget and a reallocation of those funds.”—Representative JERRY NADLER.

Now, they expect us to believe they support our law enforcement. They think that putting these bills forward will make the American people believe they care about law enforcement. It seems that it has taken them until now to see how out of touch they are with the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have to tell you, I have spent 40 years in law enforcement, 12 as a sheriff, as you know, and I have to tell you, never in my life have I seen law enforcement more under attack in America than I have for the last 2½ years—never.

I know the dangers that they face out there every day. I have been there. I have done that. I have to tell you, the attempts by those across the aisle to delegitimize, to demoralize, and to defund our State and local law enforcement is atrocious and unforgivable.

I hope that, come November, the American public will hold accountable some of these folks that you just heard read out. I can tell you, I don't think they are popular at all with the American public. Yet, now, leading into the midterms, we are going to come together, and we are going to throw four bills onto the floor to address law enforcement and show that we are supportive of law enforcement. I can tell you three of these bills are off that point.

First of all, the Mental Health Justice Act, the VICTIM Act, and the Break the Cycle of Violence Act, these three bills, let's take them one at a time.

The Mental Health Justice Act will actually make it more dangerous for

law enforcement, make it more dangerous for our citizens. We are going to literally send mental health workers to respond to volatile situations where police officers, who are armed, go in and are killed oftentimes.

Mental health calls are some of the most dangerous calls that we handle, and we want to send civilians in lieu of law enforcement? I don't think so.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The idea that we are going to send civilians to do a law enforcement officer's job in quelling a dangerous, volatile situation is bad business.

The VICTIM Act does nothing. There is nothing new in the VICTIM Act. All it does is add to the programs that already exist in DOJ—not one single new idea in the VICTIM Act.

The Break the Cycle of Violence Act, first of all, comes with a very hefty price tag, \$6.5 billion, but all that money goes to public health government bureaucrats, not law enforcement.

Listen, our job in Congress is to provide effective assistance to our law enforcement men and women. These three acts do not do that. They simply do not achieve that goal.

I am glad, however, that my colleagues have finally decided that defunding the police is not a good idea, but I wish they would look at the appropriation bills where they are basically federally defunding law enforcement because they are putting all of these strings attached to all of our DOJ grants that go to small-, medium-, and large-sized agencies.

They are never going to be able to meet those standards, never going to be able to meet all of those standards. So, basically, we just federally defunded State and local law enforcement if that passes. I hope to God it doesn't.

Instead of these misguided policies, let's work together on some solutions. Help us hire and retain some of the best and brightest officers that we have.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on all three of these bills: the Mental Health Justice Act, the VICTIM Act, and the Break the Cycle of Violence Act. These will do nothing but endanger our law enforcement men and women.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleague from Minnesota said, if I am quoting it right, "They expect us to believe they support our law enforcement." I will be honest with you. I don't expect my colleagues to believe anything, but I expect them to read the bills and to decide whether or not, if you pass these

bills, they will help make our communities safer or not.

The gentleman from Florida didn't like three of the bills, but he likes one of the bills. The beauty of this rule is you will be able to vote on all of them, and you can vote no on the ones you don't like, and you can vote yes on the ones that you do like.

When we talk about how law enforcement has been under attack, I don't want to hear any lectures from my friends on the other side of the aisle. I went through a whole litany of Republican Members who were calling for defunding the FBI.

My friends have a Member on the Republican side who actually is selling defund the FBI T-shirts on her web page. It says, "Defund the FBI." It is defund the police. My colleagues don't seem to care much about that.

I will go back to something else that I still can't get out of my mind, and that was the vote on awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Capitol Police officers who saved the lives of everybody who was here that day, and 21 Republican Members voted no. That is a disgrace. That has brought shame on this institution.

So, don't lecture any of us about our support for law enforcement when 21 of the Members on the other side of the aisle voted no on a Congressional Gold Medal to honor the brave men and women who protected us in this Chamber on that day. Enough.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, with all due respect, potentially, my colleague from Massachusetts didn't hear some of the quotes that I read earlier, many of them talking about "defunding police means defunding police," Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ.

I can go back through them, or I certainly am more than happy to provide them in writing to my colleague, but I just wanted to remind him that, yes, there were many quotes that I read regarding Democrats and defunding the police.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, one titled "Even Democrats are now admitting 'Defund the Police' was a massive mistake," and another titled "'Defund the Police' still haunts Democrats."

[From CNN Politics, Nov. 5, 2021]

EVEN DEMOCRATS ARE NOW ADMITTING 'DEFUND THE POLICE' WAS A MASSIVE MISTAKE

(By Chris Cillizza)

(CNN).—On Tuesday, a proposal to fundamentally restructure the Minneapolis police department in the wake of George Floyd's death in 2020 was soundly defeated, a setback that even many Democrats acknowledged could be laid at the feet of the "defund the police" movement that some within the party embraced last summer.

"I think allowing this moniker, 'Defund the police,' to ever get out there, was not a good thing," Minnesota Attorney General

Keith Ellison (D) told The Washington Post's Dave Weigel on Thursday.

That's a remarkable turnaround from how politicians—in and out of Minnesota—acted in the immediate aftermath of Floyd's death and the summer of nationwide protests that followed.

Nine members of the Minneapolis City Council appeared at an event in June 2020 in which they pledged that they would work to dismantle the police force in the city. They did so on a stage that featured large cutout letters spelling out "Defund Police."

"We committed to dismantling policing as we know it in the city of Minneapolis and to rebuild with our community a new model of public safety that actually keeps our community safe," City Council President Lisa Bender told CNN at the time.

That message was picked up by some of the most liberal members of Congress—from Minnesota's Ilhan Omar to Michigan's Rashida Tlaib.

New York Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, perhaps the best known progressive in Congress, warned that dismissing calls to defund the police—or, at the very least, to reconsider the way police interact with a community—was a mistake. "It is not crazy for Black and brown communities to want what White people have already given themselves and that is funding your schools more than you fund criminalizing your own kids," she said.

Even as liberal members (and the activist community) were pushing for the party to embrace the "defund the police" movement, others within the party were warning of the political dangers inherent in the slogan.

"This movement today, some people tried to hijack it," House Majority Whip Jim Clyburn (D-South Carolina), the highest ranking African American in Congress, warned his party, according to reporting in Politico. "Don't let yourselves be drawn into the debate about defunding police forces."

Clyburn's warning proved prophetic. Then-President Donald Trump seized on the issue during the 2020 campaign, casting it as evidence that Democrats were out of touch with the average person. "LAW & ORDER, NOT DEFUND AND ABOLISH THE POLICE," Trump tweeted in June 2020. "The Radical Left Democrats have gone Crazy!" And then this the following month: "Corrupt Joe Biden wants to defund our police. He may use different words, but when you look at his pact with Crazy Bernie, and other things, that's what he wants to do. It would destroy America!"

Even as Trump and Republicans were working to make "defund the police" a national issue (Joe Biden had made clear he did not favor defunding), the Minnesota politicians who were at the forefront of the "defund" movement were beginning to back off in the face of rising crime in the city. As Minnesota Public Radio reported in September 2020:

"Just months after leading an effort that would have defunded the police department, City Council members at Tuesday's work session pushed chief Medaria Arradondo to tell them how the department is responding to the violence.

"The number of reported violent crimes, like assaults, robberies and homicides are up compared to 2019, according to MPD crime data. More people have been killed in the city in the first nine months of 2020 than were slain in all of last year. Property crimes, like burglaries and auto thefts, are also up. Incidents of arson have increased 55 percent over the total at this point in 2019." (The City Council had, months before, moved \$1.1 million from the police department to the health department.)

After several fits and starts, Question 2 was added to the 2021 ballot. Among its Provisions was replacing the Minnesota police

department with a department of public safety, getting rid of language that requires a minimum number of police officers to be employed by the city and forcing the mayor to win the city council's support for someone to run the new department.

While the vote was expected to be quite close, it was, in fact, not. As CNN wrote of the results:

"The status quo-affirming result is a setback to both citywide and national efforts to fundamentally reduce or eliminate the role of police in America. Opponents of calls to 'defund the police' will point to the vote as fresh evidence that the backlash to police abuse that fueled last year's protests, which followed the killing of Floyd by then Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin. Talk of curbing police departments by cutting or limiting their resources has run into a countervailing wall of concern over public safety and waning support from early allies—including leading Democrats who largely view it as political poison."

The question now for Democrats is whether they totally abandon efforts to remake policing in this country. (A bipartisan police reform attempt failed in Congress earlier this year.) Or if they continue on while doing their best to leave the "defund the police" slogan behind them.

[From Roll Call, Apr. 27, 2022]

'DEFUND THE POLICE' STILL HAUNTS DEMOCRATS

(By David Winston)

It's becoming increasingly clear that after the economy, crime is a hot-button issue driving voter sentiment in the lead-up to the November elections. But despite voter concern, Democrats continue to be divided over the controversial "defund the police" mantra that has grabbed headlines for the past two years, and it's beginning to hurt their prospects for the fall elections.

The mixed messaging of party leaders versus the call to defund by progressives, especially extreme comments by members of the Squad, has become a costly roadblock to retaining the House as voters lose confidence in Democrats' ability to address rising violence across the country.

Even a cursory look at statements by Democratic leaders and radical backbenchers opposed to increased funding of police explains the party's dilemma.

On Feb. 13, George Stephanopoulos raised the issue of Rep. Cori Bush's statements calling for defunding the police during an interview with Speaker Nancy Pelosi. "With all due respect in the world to Cori Bush," she replied, "that is not the position of the Democratic Party."

Pelosi then declared, "Defund the police is dead."

Two weeks later, in his State of the Union address, President Biden called for increased funding for police: "We should all agree: The answer is not to defund the police. The answer is to fund the police. Fund them. Fund them."

Apparently, Squad member Bush didn't get the message. In a tweet after the speech, she said, "With all due respect, Mr. President, you didn't mention saving Black lives once in this speech. All our country has done is given more funding to police. The result? 2021 set a record for fatal police shootings. Defund the police. Invest in our communities."

A month later, a gunman shot up a New York subway train, and an inconvenient 2019 letter from Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Jerrold Nadler and other liberal New York House members resurfaced. The letter to then-Gov. Andrew Cuomo opposed a plan to put 500 new Metropolitan Transportation Authority officers in the subways to reduce crime.

But AOC was having none of it. She and her fellow members wrote that the MTA funding for increased police presence in the subways would be better spent on "desperately needed resources" like "subway, bus, maintenance, and service improvements," telling Cuomo, "The subway system is now safer than before."

Last week, Rep. Abigail Spanberger called defunding the police "a terrible idea," while a Politico story said, "As the midterm elections pick up, Democrats are calling for more police funding and attempting to co-opt traditionally Republican talking points on crime."

"Defund the police" may no longer be the position of the Democratic Party, but when Cori Bush, AOC or any member of the Squad weighs in on any issue, the Twittersphere lights up like a cop car in hot pursuit. It seems the media can't get enough of the Squad, and polling shows that this intraparty fight over the issue of policing and crime has not only become a major headache for Pelosi but is also taking a toll on the Democrats' credibility.

When the electorate was asked in the Winning the Issues (WTI) February survey if they believed that we need to defund the police, only 21 percent believed the statement, while 64 percent did not. Independents were even more adamant that defunding the police was a bad idea, coming in at an overwhelming 12 percent for and 70 percent against.

Despite Biden and Pelosi's efforts to stem the bleeding by offering up more funding to stop gun violence and invest in community policing, the WTI research shows that Democrats are losing the issue, with more voters believing that the Democratic Party supports defunding the police than not by a margin of 48 percent to 34 percent.

There are three main reasons for the Democrats' troubles on this issue. First, there is widespread recognition of just how serious rising crime is becoming, with 7 out of 10 voters believing that across America, violent crime is escalating.

Six out of 10 voters agree with the statement that "families, communities and small business are being endangered and experiencing the devastating effects of rhetoric about defunding the police and police department budget cuts at the hands of politicians."

These views extend across party, ideology, age and region, making a concept like defunding the police totally out of tune with most voters who oppose it by a 3-to-1 margin.

There's a second reason for the Democrats' weakness on the crime issue. The president and other Democrats have tried to have it both ways—trying to pose as supporters of the police while only reluctantly, if at all, acknowledging that crime is a major problem.

On the White House website list of priorities, crime doesn't even make the list. The White House's lack of acknowledgment and often dismissive rhetoric about crime, particularly in cities with progressive mayors and prosecutors, has led directly to its weak standing on the issue.

As a result, when voters were asked in the March survey whether they believed Democrats would focus on law enforcement efforts to deal with violent offenders, they were split, with 44 percent believing they would and 43 percent believing they wouldn't. Independents were even more skeptical, with 36 percent believing and 46 percent not believing.

In contrast, voters by a 61 percent to 27 percent margin believed that Republicans would stand with law enforcement in their efforts to ensure the safety of our commu-

nities and the protection of America's families and children.

Not surprisingly, Democrats trail on the handling of the crime and safety issue by 12 points (48 percent favoring Republicans, 36 percent favoring Democrats) and among independents by 13 points (42 percent–29 percent, with 29 percent undecided). The Democratic Party's silence about threats to safety has left Democrats supporting a policy position that voters find alienating.

Finally, with police officers, Democrats have chosen the wrong group to vilify. The police have a very favorable brand image (72 percent favorable, 20 percent unfavorable in the March WTI survey). Congressional Democrats have a negative brand at 44 percent favorable, 49 percent unfavorable. By affiliating themselves with the defund the police movement, they are seen by voters as opposing a very positive group of public servants who are well liked and supported by the electorate.

By trying to straddle the fence on crime and safety, Biden, Pelosi and Democratic members fearing primaries have been unwilling to take on their anti-police progressives. If the trend continues, this issue will haunt Democrats this November and for a long time to come.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, Democrats have long respected and supported our law enforcement. As Representatives GUEST and LETLOW so eloquently stated in their resolution to express support for recognizing National Police Week, they serve with valor, dignity, and integrity.

They are charged with pursuing justice for all individuals and performing the duties of a law enforcement officer with fidelity to the constitutional rights and civil rights of the public that the officers serve.

They swear an oath to uphold the public trust, even though through the performance of their duties of law enforcement officers, the officers may become targets of senseless acts of violence.

They have bravely continued to meet the call of duty to ensure the security of their neighborhoods and communities at the risk of their own personal safety in the time of a viral pandemic.

There were 619 officers killed in the line of duty in 2021. Republicans honor all of them and prioritize protecting and supporting today's officers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from The Guardian titled "Republicans are defunding the police: FOX News anchor stumps Congressman."

[From the Guardian, June 28, 2021]

REPUBLICANS ARE DEFUNDING THE POLICE— FOX NEWS ANCHOR STUMPS CONGRESSMAN

(By Martin Pengelly)

The Fox News anchor Chris Wallace made headlines of his own on Sunday, by pointing out to a senior Republican that he and the rest of his party recently voted against \$350bn in funding for law enforcement.

"Can't you make the argument that it's you and the Republicans who are defunding the police?" Wallace asked Jim Banks, the head of the House Republican study committee.

The congressman was the author of a Fox News column in which he said Democrats were responsible for spikes in violent crime.

"There is overwhelming evidence," Banks wrote, "connecting the rise in murders to the violent riots last summer"—a reference to protests over the murder of George Floyd which sometimes produced looting and violence—"and the defund the police movement. Both of which were supported, financially and rhetorically, by the Democratic party and the Biden administration."

Joe Biden does not support any attempt to "defund the police", a slogan adopted by some on the left but which remains controversial and which the president has said Republicans have used to "beat the living hell" out of Democrats.

On Fox News Sunday, Banks repeatedly attacked the so-called "Squad" of young progressive women in the House and said Democrats "stigmatised" law enforcement and helped criminals.

"Let me push back on that a little bit," Wallace said. "Because [this week] the president said that the central part in his anti-crime package is the \$350bn in the American Rescue Plan, the Covid relief plan that was passed."

Covid relief passed through Congress in March, under rules that meant it did not require Republican votes. It did not get a single one.

Asked if that meant it was "you and the Republicans who are defunding the police", Banks dodged the question.

Wallace said: "No, no, sir, respectfully—wait, sir, respectfully ... I'm asking you, there's \$350bn in this package the president says can be used for policing . . ."

"Congressman Banks, let me finish, and I promise I will give you a chance to answer. The president is saying cities and states can use this money to hire more police officers, invest in new technologies and develop summer job training and recreation programs for young people. Respectfully, I've heard your point about the last year, but you and every other Republican voted against this \$350bn."

Turning a blind eye to Wallace's question, Banks said: "If we turn a blind eye to law and order, and a blind eye to riots that occurred in cities last summer, and we take police officers off the street, we're inevitably going to see crime rise."

Wallace asked if Banks could support any gun control legislation. Banks said that if Biden was "serious about reducing violent crime in America", he should "admonish the radical voices in the Democrat [sic] party that have stigmatised police officers and law enforcement".

Despite working for Republicans' favoured broadcaster, Wallace is happy to hold their feet to the fire, as grillings of Donald Trump and Kevin McCarthy have shown.

He has also attracted criticism, for example for failing to control Trump during a chaotic presidential debate last year which one network rival called "a hot mess, inside a dumpster fire, inside a train wreck".

Last year, Wallace told the Guardian: "I do what I do and I'm sitting there during the week trying to come up with the best guests and the best show I possibly can and I'm not sitting there thinking about how do we fit in some media commentary."

"We're not there to try to one-up the president or any politician."

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, if you look at the voting record of many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you will see few to none supported recent funding bills that also direct money toward supporting local law enforcement. If they think that we are on a crusade to defund the police,

well, the last few years of funding the police say otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a Rolling Stone article titled "'Back-The-Blue' Republicans Bail on Moment of Silence for Fallen Capitol Police Officers."

[From Rolling Stone, Jan. 6, 2022]

'BACK-THE-BLUE' REPUBLICANS BAIL ON MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR FALLEN CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS

(By Tim Dickinson)

The Republican Party holds itself as the champions of law enforcement. They campaign on slogans of "Back the Blue." They hold rallies flying the "Thin Blue Line" flag. They purport to celebrate the cops who shield the nation from violence and anarchy.

But when it came time to show up in the halls of Congress for a remembrance of the sacrifices Capitol and Metropolitan Police made defending our democracy from violence last Jan. 6, Republicans lawmakers didn't bother to show up. Only one sitting Republican officeholder showed up, Wyoming Rep. Liz Cheney. She was accompanied by her father Dick, the former vice president.

On that dark day one year ago, the "Thin Blue Line" was not a metaphor. Police put their bodies and lives in harm's way, attempting to blockade the joint session of Congress from the violent mob of Trump supporters who sought to stop the peaceful transfer of power after a lawful election. These cops were beaten, tased, tear gassed, dragged down steps, and crushed in doorways. More than 140 were injured in the insurrection, and five officer deaths (including subsequent suicides) have been linked to the violence and trauma of Jan. 6.

"I want to acknowledge our fallen heroes of that day," said Speaker Nancy Pelosi, leading a House session marking the anniversary of the attack. "Now I ask all members to rise in a moment of silence in their memory."

As the officials rose, the visual of a nearly empty GOP side of the aisle was chilling, as Sen. Chris Murphy of Connecticut noted on Twitter:

At the moment of silence for the Capitol Police officers who died, there were only two Republicans who showed up.

Rep. Lynn Cheney. And her father. The 80 year old former Vice President.

An extraordinary image of where this country's politics are right now.

—Chris Murphy January 6, 2022

Speaking to reporters at the Capitol, the former vice president said he attended the House session to mark "an important historical event." Cheney elaborated that he was "deeply disappointed we don't have better leadership in the Republican Party to restore the Constitution." The swipe at Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell and House minority leader Kevin McCarthy—who could not be bothered to attend the remembrance, and who have done little to combat Trump's destructive and ongoing lies about the 2020 election—was unmistakable.

Rep. Cheney's attendance was not surprising. She is the top Republican on the bipartisan congressional committee investigating the events of Jan. 6, and has been consistent and unabashed in her criticism of Donald Trump, blaming him directly for the violence at the Capitol. Cheney has been treated as a pariah by Trump—who has called her a "bitter, horrible human being"—and was ousted from GOP House leadership earlier this year for refusing to kowtow to the Dear Leader.

Rep. Adam Kinzinger, the other Republican on the Jan. 6 committee, is expecting

the birth of a child and could not attend. "Wish I could be there too, but I'm on baby watch," he tweeted. "I am in spirit."

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I find it hard to believe that someone says they back the police when they don't even do the bare minimum and show up and remember those who fought to save the lives of our very democracy and every single person in this Chamber that day.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I point out that my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, Congressman STAUBER, who is former law enforcement, has twice now released the JUSTICE Act, a common-sense police reform bill, that would rebuild trust between law enforcement and communities they serve.

□ 0945

Why is it that that has not come to the floor yet? And why is that not part of the package that we are looking at?

Congressman STAUBER was a police officer for 20 years. He knows law enforcement exists to serve America's communities, and he knows what is needed to rebuild the damaged relationship between officers and civilians.

The Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere, or the JUSTICE Act, would fund better training for police officers, increase the number of body cameras, and provide important grants to police departments to help implement community policing best practices. Sound familiar?

He introduced this bill this Congress and last Congress and, yet, despite its past bipartisan support, Democrats continuously blocked efforts to bring this to the floor.

Why would Democrats block such a commonsense bill for years and now decide it is necessary to pass these bills?

Let's just take a look at what they spent time promoting instead. For example, the Democrats so-called George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is a divisive bill being pushed through by the majority without any Republican input. Disguised as accountability, the bill would make communities less safe, hinder law enforcement's ability to do their job, limit the readiness of law enforcement, and demonizes an entire profession for the actions of a few.

It eliminates qualified immunity protections for Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers which protect officers who have to operate in high-pressure, quick-decision environments.

It lowers the mental standard for Federal civil rights lawsuits. It allows officer convictions, even if the officer has no specific intent to deprive a person of a Federal right.

I have given a couple of examples of good, strong Republican legislation that was not considered as even part of the Democrats' so-called police or law

enforcement support grouping of bills that they have put together today in an emergency meeting yesterday.

If there was truly support for law enforcement, they would have come together in a bipartisan manner, discussed it with law enforcement, discussed it with the minority, and really come together and created legislation that would truly do what we need it to do, and that is support and help our law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, today's debate is nothing more than a political stunt, as I have mentioned. The Democrats have put forward these bills at the last minute so they can go home this weekend and pretend they have done something to help police in this country.

I mentioned it before. If the majority was sincere about supporting law enforcement, they would have involved the minority. They would have had discussion about the bills, good solid bills that the minority has put forward, and they would have had discussions with law enforcement across the country to find real solutions.

Our police do need our help. There is a war on police in this country, thanks to the efforts of those on the far left. They know it; I know it; and the American people know it.

But these bills are just one more insincere attempt. One mostly recreates programs that already exist within the DOJ. The other includes a section that still gives preference to efforts that do not include recruitment and retainment.

Honestly, Madam Speaker, my colleagues should be embarrassed and ashamed of this political stunt, especially when it comes to something that affects everyone's safety and the American people's safety.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I encourage Members to do the same.

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

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

I thank the gentlewoman for that closing statement. I keep hearing the Democrats want to defund the police, so here we are on the House floor talking about creating grant programs to help keep communities safer. Now the Republicans are the ones who are talking about defunding the police. Do you see the irony?

Democrats actually have solutions in these four bills; real ideas that have been publicly available for months to make our streets safer and reduce crime. Republicans are the ones talking about defunding and abolishing the FBI.

I will remind my colleagues that you have Republican Members who are raising campaign funds by selling Defund the FBI T-shirts. Want to talk about disgusting?

No mention of that from my colleagues. Fundraising off of selling T-shirts to defund the police; that is what my friends are doing.

Again, I go back to my point earlier. I still can't get over that 21 Republicans couldn't even vote to give a Congressional Gold Medal to the men and women who defended us on January 6. I mean, talk about disgusting. Couldn't show up on the House floor for a moment of silence to honor those police who lost their lives as a result of what happened on January 6. Talk about disgusting.

We have ideas here that I think are worth bipartisan support. Some of this stuff I think should have been brought up under suspension. But, again, my friends put politics ahead of people. We want to put people ahead of politics.

Take the VICTIM Act, H.R. 5768. This establishes a grant program in the Department of Justice to help State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies improve their clearance rates for homicides and nonfatal shootings. To me, that seems common sense.

The Break the Cycle of Violence Act, H.R. 4118, creates a nationwide strategy to make our communities safer by addressing both the symptoms and root causes of violence.

The Invest to Protect Act, H.R. 6448, makes targeted investments to ensure that local police departments have the training they need to keep our communities safe.

The Mental Health Justice Act, H.R. 8542; one in four fatal police encounters ends the life of an individual with severe mental illness. The Mental Health Justice Act makes it easier to send trained mental health professionals to respond to individuals experiencing a mental health crisis.

To me, these are basic, commonsense bills that I think the overwhelming majority of people in this country, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, would all support.

You want to talk about not supporting our law enforcement. Republicans voted against \$350 billion in the American Rescue Plan that could be used for policing. So please don't lecture us about defunding the police. Republicans only seem to support law enforcement when they are looking for votes. That is a common theme here, when it is politically convenient for them. It is really shameful, and it is cynical. It is why people get frustrated with Washington because everything has a political motivation.

On stuff that we all should come together on, my friends on the other side of the aisle always come up with an issue, an excuse not to do the right thing. You don't have to agree on everything to agree on something, and this is something we ought to agree on and we ought to come together on and get it done.

These are good bills, Madam Speaker, bipartisan bills. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker. I rise today in strong support of this robust public safety package—legislation rooted in two of Demo-

crats' most cherished values: safety and justice.

On behalf of our Caucus and the Congress, I salute the persistent, values-driven leadership of CBC Chairwoman JOYCE BEATTY and Members of the CBC—ensuring that accountability is central to our efforts.

Let us also commend Progressive Caucus Chair PRAMILA JAYAPAL and Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR for their tireless efforts to advance the goal of public safety for all.

We applaud the committed leaders of the legislation before us today: Congressman JOSH GOTTHEIMER, Congresswoman KATIE PORTER, Congressman STEVEN HORSFORD, and Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS.

And thank you to Judiciary Chair JERRY NADLER and Energy & Commerce Chair FRANK PALLONE for steering this legislation to the Floor.

House Democrats believe that every American deserves to live in a safe community—where they and their family can thrive.

For us, this is a deeply held value.

And that is why our Majority has long sought—and today, continues to take—strong, commonsense action to fund our police, giving them the tools they need to prevent crime.

Let me be clear: Democrats salute our law enforcement heroes.

And we have fought to support them: securing a half-billion-dollar increase for local and state law enforcement in March's Appropriations legislation.

At the same time, we remain fully committed to improving training and accountability among the law enforcement ranks.

Our nation remains outraged at the scourge of systemic racism and brutality targeting communities of color and marginalized communities—knowing that it remains a serious threat to safety.

That is why Democrats will never stop fighting for the fundamental transformation that our culture of policing demands—which goes hand-in-hand with our unyielding commitment to public safety.

Our George Floyd Justice in Policing Act—twice passed by the House—includes strong, unprecedented reforms to save lives: from banning chokeholds; to stopping no-knock warrants; to combating racial profiling; to establishing nationwide standards against misconduct.

Sadly, this urgent and necessary legislation was blocked by Republicans.

But under the leadership of our brilliant, relentless Congresswoman KAREN BASS, we will not rest until these life-saving measures are the law of the land.

Today, with our four bills, we seek to take a strong step to build stronger, healthier relationships between law enforcement and those they serve.

And together, they will help prevent crime, save lives and advance justice.

Our Invest to Protect Act funds our police, with grants to: help small, local law enforcement agencies retain and recruit officers; require the Attorney General to evaluate and collect data on how police departments are using the funds to reduce the use of force; and invest in strong accountability measures, including: training for de-escalation, responding to substance use disorders, supporting survivors of domestic violence, and promoting a duty of care.

Our Mental Health Justice Act will help send unarmed mental health professionals to respond to mental health crises in our neighborhoods: crucial action to save lives.

Our Break the Cycle of Violence Act invests in effective, evidence-based community violence intervention initiatives—building on the lifesaving progress we forged in our American Rescue Plan.

Our VICTIM Act will bolster the ability of police forces to solve homicides, sexual assaults, shootings and other violent crimes: a necessary step to ensure justice is served and improve trust in law enforcement.

In the same spirit, House Democrats take immense pride in our work so far this Congress to keep America's families safe from harm.

Under the magnificent leadership of President Biden, we enacted an historic gun violence prevention law—which is saving lives by getting deadly weapons out of dangerous hands.

Meanwhile, the House has successfully passed legislation reinstating the Assault Weapons Ban and establishing an AMBER Alert-style warning during shootings—measures that strongly support our law enforcement.

And this Congress, our Majority has also passed legislation to: require universal background checks, promote safe storage, and ban bump stocks, high-capacity magazines and ghost guns.

Make no mistake: our colleagues across the aisle overwhelmingly voted against all of these measures.

Because they fail to realize that preventing gun crime is a crucial piece of the puzzle in building safer communities—especially for our children.

Madam Speaker. Every Member who has the special privilege of serving in these hallowed halls takes a sacred oath to the American people.

That oath—which is blind to party affiliation—is to “protect & defend.”

And with this package today, the House is honoring this foremost responsibility.

So I encourage every Member to join us in putting People Over Politics—and vote for safer communities in every corner of the country.

With that, I urge a resounding, bipartisan AYE vote on all four bills in this strong public safety package.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1229

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 1377 on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCCARTHY (during the vote). Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is a Member that is 3 minutes out on their way with the right to vote. As you held up the others, do they have the right to hold?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

The Clerk will report the tally.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 215, answered “present” 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—216

Adams	Courtney	Jackson Lee
Aguilar	Craig	Jacobs (CA)
Allred	Crow	Jayapal
Auchincloss	Cuellar	Jeffries
Axne	Davids (KS)	Johnson (GA)
Barragán	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (TX)
Bass	Dean	Jones
Beatty	DeFazio	Kahele
Bera	DeGette	Kaptur
Beyer	DeLauro	Keating
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	Demings	Khanna
Blunt Rochester	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Bonamici	Deutch	Kilmer
Bourdeaux	Dingell	Kim (NJ)
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Kind
F.	Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick
Brown (MD)	F.	Krishnamoorthi
Brown (OH)	Escobar	Kuster
Brownley	Eshoo	Lamb
Bustos	Españillat	Langevin
Butterfield	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Carbajal	Fletcher	Larson (CT)
Cárdenas	Foster	Lawrence
Carson	Frankel, Lois	Lawson (FL)
Carter (LA)	Gallego	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lee (NV)
Case	Garcia (IL)	Leger Fernandez
Casten	Garcia (TX)	Levin (CA)
Castor (FL)	Golden	Levin (MI)
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Lieu
Cherfilus-	Gonzalez,	Lofgren
McCormick	Vicente	Lowenthal
Chu	Gottheimer	Luria
Cicilline	Green, Al (TX)	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Malinowski
Clarke (NY)	Harder (CA)	Maloney,
Cleaver	Hayes	Carolyn B.
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	Maloney, Sean
Cohen	Himes	Manning
Connolly	Horsford	Matsui
Cooper	Houlahan	McBath
Correa	Hoyer	McCollum
Costa	Huffman	McEachin

McGovern	Porter	Speier
McNerney	Price (NC)	Stansbury
Meeks	Quigley	Stanton
Meng	Raskin	Stevens
Mfume	Rice (NY)	Strickland
Moore (WI)	Ross	Suozi
Morelle	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell
Moulton	Ruiz	Takano
Mrvan	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ryan (NY)	Titus
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Neal	Sánchez	Torres (CA)
Neguse	Sarbanes	Torres (NY)
Newman	Scanlon	Trahan
Norcross	Schakowsky	Trone
O'Halleran	Schiff	Underwood
Omar	Schneider	Vargas
Pallone	Schrader	Veasey
Panetta	Schrier	Velázquez
Pappas	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Pascarell	Scott, David	Schultz
Payne	Sewell	Waters
Pelosi	Sherman	Watson Coleman
Peltola	Sherrill	Welch
Perlmutter	Sires	Wexton
Peters	Slotkin	Wild
Phillips	Smith (WA)	Williams (GA)
Pingree	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Pocan	Spanberger	Yarmuth

NAYS—215

Aderholt	Franklin, C.	Massie
Allen	Scott	Mast
Amodei	Fulcher	McCarthy
Armstrong	Gaetz	McCaul
Arrington	Gallagher	McClain
Babin	Garbarino	McClintock
Bacon	Garcia (CA)	McHenry
Baird	Gibbs	McKinley
Balderson	Gimenez	Meijer
Banks	Gohmert	Meuser
Barr	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (IL)
Bentz	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller (WV)
Bergman	Good (VA)	Miller-Meeks
Bice (OK)	Gooden (TX)	Moolenaar
Biggs	Gosar	Mooney
Bilirakis	Granger	Moore (AL)
Bishop (NC)	Graves (LA)	Moore (UT)
Boebert	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Bost	Green (TN)	Murphy (NC)
Bowman	Greene (GA)	Nehls
Brady	Griffith	Newhouse
Brooks	Grothman	Norman
Buchanan	Guest	Oberholte
Buck	Guthrie	Ocasio-Cortez
Bucshon	Harris	Owens
Budd	Harshbarger	Palazzo
Burchett	Hartzler	Palmer
Burgess	Hern	Pence
Bush	Herrell	Perry
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Pfleger
Cammack	Hice (GA)	Posey
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Carl	Hill	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Cawthorn	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Huizenga	Rose
Cline	Issa	Rosendale
Cloud	Jackson	Rouzer
Clyde	Jacobs (NY)	Roy
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rutherford
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Salazar
Conway	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Crawford	Jordan	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Sempolinski
Davidson	Katko	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Keller	Simpson
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Donalds	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Kinzing	Smucker
Dunn	Kustoff	Spartz
Ellzey	LaHood	Stauber
Emmer	LaMalfa	Steel
Estes	Lamborn	Stefanik
Fallon	Latta	Steil
Feenstra	LaTurner	Steube
Ferguson	Lesko	Stewart
Finstad	Letlow	Taylor
Fischbach	Long	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Tiffany
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Flood	Mace	Tlaib
Flores	Malliotakis	Turner
Fox	Mann	Upton