

must defend the lawful rights of all, including those whose actions make them subject to the American justice system. The actions taken by the administration to arrest, detain, or deport without lawful due process sets a dangerous precedent for us all, even those who one day may count themselves among former holders of high office. Americans also now risk being subject to retaliatory treatment in other countries. Given the centuries-old protections granted by our Constitution, I urge the administration to rethink its actions in order to preserve the letter and the spirit of our American laws."

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

What would You have us do today, O Lord?

What decisions would You have us make?

What words would You have us speak?

What actions would You have us take?

Teach us Your way this day, O Lord, that we may rely on Your faithfulness.

Then give us an undivided heart that when we are faced with challenges, we would rely on Your wisdom; when we are met with resistance, we would count on Your strength; when we face doubt, we would believe in Your eternal grace plan; when we are overwhelmed with fatigue, we would know Your everlasting arms will uphold us.

Great is Your love toward us, O God. May our lives this day reflect our faith in Your steadfast love.

In Your sovereign name we pray.  
Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.

WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### TRUMP PROMOTES FREE SYRIA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump has begun the first trade trip of his second term, announcing a historic agreement with Saudi Arabia and others to invest \$1.4 trillion in America, creating jobs.

More historic foreign policy wins are expected as President Trump and Secretary of State Marco Rubio continue their trip now to Qatar and then UAE.

Courageously, President Donald Trump announced yesterday he is lifting sanctions on Syria to provide the country a "chance at greatness." Sanctions were imposed on the murderous Assad dictatorship, which in November declared: I was an enemy of the state, and weeks later the dictator fled to Moscow.

Today was a historic meeting between President Trump and Syrian President Ahmed al-Sharaa, as arranged by Saudi Arabia and Turkiye, with the opportunity to expel Russian bases from Syria.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, hosting murderous dictators.

#### MEDICAID BENEFITS ALL OF US

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in your defense and in defense of all of your fellow Medicaid beneficiaries.

Now before you say, wait a minute, Medicaid is for poor people, and I am not poor. Here is the thing: If you cut Medicaid, community health centers shut down, which means that instead of preventative care, folks go to emergency rooms. If you ever need urgent medical attention, and there is an ER bed available, you are a Medicaid beneficiary.

If you cut Medicaid, public school kids with special needs won't get the targeted resources that they need. If you are a kid or if you are the parent

of a kid who is getting help from a teacher who is not otherwise overwhelmed by their workload, then you are a Medicaid beneficiary.

If you cut Medicaid, a whole lot of hospitals will close. If you have an operating hospital within driving distance of your home, congratulations, you are a Medicaid beneficiary.

Medicaid benefits all of us. Yet, the Republican plan that they are debating would cut that program by \$700 billion, making us all sicker, more vulnerable, and making sure that people die. However, at least they can tell Donald Trump that they gave him a tax cut.

I hope they are proud of themselves because no one else is.

#### CONDEMNING ATTACKS ON KNOWLEDGE AND HISTORY

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn President Trump's attack on knowledge and on history.

Last week, he fired our beloved Librarian of Congress. He fired the head of the U.S. Copyright Office for perhaps writing a report that his tech billionaire backers didn't agree with. He has cut funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the National Endowment for the Humanities. This is cutting funding for important programs that tell our history, that tell our culture across the United States.

In New Mexico, we are proud of our diverse, and often conflicting and difficult, but always fascinating history and culture. I ask President Trump why is he afraid of the complexities and the brilliance of our history?

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2240, IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2243, LEOSA REFORM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2255, FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SERVICE WEAPON PURCHASE ACT OF 2025

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 405 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 405

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. The respective amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in each such bill shall be considered as adopted. Each such bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions

in each such bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 2240) to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 2243) to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 2255) to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), 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. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule providing for consideration of three pieces of legislation—H.R. 2240, H.R. 2243, and H.R. 2255—which will all be considered under a closed rule, each with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. Additionally, the rule provides each with a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are here in Washington this week to continue to work on behalf of the American people. This is, in fact, Police Week, but we have been busy this year, this Congress delivering for the American people.

In this Congress so far, we have passed legislation to secure our elections, H.R. 222, the SAVE Act; hold rogue activist judges accountable, H.R. 1526; bring transparency to institutes of higher education, H.R. 1048; make changes to our border with the Laken Riley Act and the HALT Fentanyl Act; and to repeal the Biden-era harmful environmental regulations by passing what we call Congressional Review Acts to undo the damage of the Biden administration.

As Republicans continue to work on behalf of the American people and fi-

nalize the reconciliation products we are working on currently, we are also here to recognize National Police Week and the thousands of law enforcement officers who wake up every day to step on that thin blue line to defend and protect us.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation which designated May 15 as Peace Officer Memorial Day, and the week in which that date falls as Police Week.

Yesterday, my staff and I got the opportunity to welcome police officers from New Braunfels, Texas, and hear about the challenges they face every day. I talk to the men and women in blue virtually every day in the district that I represent, as I know many of my colleagues do.

My grandfather was the chief of police of a small west Texas town called Sweetwater. I was blessed to work in the United States Attorney's office and the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Texas, working every day with law enforcement. What they do matters for the peace and security of our country. Our Republic depends on having security on our streets.

There are thousands of stories that I can share about the daily heroism of law enforcement officers across the country, hundreds I could share even in the district I represent.

On February 16, 2024, Austin Police Department officers Dalton Schroeder and Jason Wright responded to 4-year-old William Martinez Romero, who was choking. The officers quickly jumped into action. Body cam footage shows Officer Schroeder run to his cruiser to grab an antichoking device he bought with his own money to be prepared for situations just like this, while Officer Wright started supporting William with back blows. They saved his life that day.

We must also remember that Police Week honors fallen peace officers, including one officer who died in the line of duty, Austin Police Department Senior Officer Jorge Pastore died in action November 11, 2023, responding to a domestic violence call in South Austin. Hostages were held inside a home, and when officers attempted to enter, gunfire started to go off. The SWAT team was called in to help distract the suspect, one being Officer Pastore, who was trying to rescue the victims.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say we couldn't be more excited to welcome tens of thousands of law enforcement officers from around the country to D.C. this week.

Let's be clear: House Republicans and President Trump are mobilized to restore order and sanity in the United States, something that had been lacking for years.

I remember the days, as I know my colleagues do, in 2020 when there were fires and destruction rampant across the country, as our cities were being burned to the ground and law enforcement was being targeted. It was unacceptable.

There are Members of this body, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who were encouraging it. They were undermining our law enforcement officers, making it more difficult for them to carry out their jobs, who were challenging them. It was important that we stood by them, and it is important now that the President and Republicans are standing by our law enforcement officers.

Americans suffered due to the amplification of that extreme rhetoric against law enforcement. The homicide rates stayed significantly higher through 2022 after massively skyrocketing in the wake of 2020.

The rule before us today is another step in helping law enforcement officers across the Nation which, after 4 years of a Biden-run Department of Justice targeting police departments, should be a welcome relief to our men and women in blue.

This week we will consider three pieces of legislation to support our brothers and sisters in law enforcement. H.R. 2255, the Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act of 2025, which would allow Federal law enforcement officers the opportunity to purchase the service weapons they used before obtaining a new one; H.R. 2243, the LEOSA Reform Act, which amends the Gun-Free School Zones Act to provide an exemption for law enforcement officers certified under the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act to carry a concealed firearm in a gun-free school zone; and H.R. 2240, Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, which would require the Attorney General to submit a report to Congress that includes data on attacks on law enforcement.

These bills are widely supported by law enforcement groups. The Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Major County Sheriffs of America, National Association of Police Organizations, National Narcotics Officers' Associations' Coalition, and Sergeants Benevolent Association of the NYPD sent a letter on March 25, 2025, to the House Judiciary Committee urging support of these bills and advancement to the House floor.

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

□ 1215

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, as every day, I stand in honor of our police and our law enforcement. I often say to those who serve that to serve is an act of love. I recognize the love of those who step up to put their lives on the line and to put their lives in a place of danger to protect us. I honor that service and that love.

Today, like last night, I heard an outrageous lie about which party supports law enforcement. Let's look at

the facts. Republican President Donald Trump's proposed budget will slash funding for the ATF and Drug Enforcement Administration, fire FBI employees, wipe out community policing grants, and gut civil rights enforcement.

Trump's budget doesn't support local law enforcement. It hurts them.

In my rural district, local law enforcement actually needs more support. I am outraged when Republicans say Federal help is duplicative, which is what they said last night in the Rules Committee.

I have spoken with the police officers and sheriffs who traverse thousands of miles of bumpy rural roads in my district. Rio Arriba County, for example, is bigger than the State of Connecticut, yet it has fewer than two dozen police officers.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what helps a small, rural police department like Rio Arriba? Do you know what the sheriffs need? They need support from the FBI and Federal law enforcement. FBI comes in and helps them solve crimes.

Tribal law enforcement also relies on the FBI. Tribal leaders frequently describe the long wait times for police to arrive and the countless criminal investigations left unsolved because there aren't enough FBI agents.

Mr. Speaker, when you cut funding for the FBI, as Republican President Trump proposes in his budget, you are not cutting duplicative funding. You are cutting essential investigative services. It is a guarantee that crimes will go unsolved.

The partnership between law enforcement agencies at all levels is critical to keep our communities safe. From the sheriff in Rio Arriba to the Capitol Police officers right outside these doors, each plays an important role. Unfortunately, not everybody respects all of our law enforcement officers.

In this very building, January 6 insurrectionists brutally attacked the Capitol Police and law enforcement officers from multiple jurisdictions. More than 140 police suffered injuries and went to the hospital. Five officers died. Then, President Trump pardoned the violent thugs who battered those police officers. It is a shame.

Every day, we walk by our dedicated Capitol Police, yet very few Republicans have the courage to condemn the pardons of the violent thugs who beat the police. Last night during Rules, we couldn't even get a Republican who is a former prosecutor to condemn the pardons—more shame. If Republicans truly backed the blue, they would all denounce those pardons.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my colleague from Texas condemned those pardons. Is he willing to do so now?

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to what Americans are focused on right now and what the thousands of callers to congressional offices, Republican and Democratic, are worried about. It is Republican cuts to Medicaid.

This is a big week for Republicans. As reported in Punchbowl, it is their once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to cut Medicaid.

This week in the dead of night while America was sleeping, Republican committees took a sledgehammer to life-saving programs like Medicaid. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what is happening. Democrats fought all night to save 8.6 million Americans from losing access to Medicaid. That doesn't include the 4.2 million Americans who will start paying a whole lot more for their healthcare premiums so big corporations can get their tax deductions.

Republicans voted down every single amendment that Democrats offered to protect Medicaid. Let me remind everybody that in more than 25 districts, more than a third of the constituents rely on Medicaid. That includes Republican Nick Begich's and ROBERT BRESNAHAN's districts. Not a single Republican had the courage to stand up for their constituents.

The people are showing up in our offices to demand that Republicans listen to them. Some are protesting in their wheelchairs.

Yesterday, I spoke to a disabled woman named Julie outside the committee markup. Thirty-five years ago, Julie crawled up the House steps to demand that Congress pass the Americans with Disabilities Act. She is now back to beg for the bare minimum. She told me that she doesn't trust Republicans to protect her healthcare. Based on their votes, she is right.

Congress listened to her plea 35 years ago. Now, the wealthy interests and Trump's pressure are just too much. Republicans won't listen to a word from Julie or the 80 disabled advocates who came with her. She and other advocates are asking them to protect Medicaid and to protect the services they need. Even though they are in wheelchairs, they are not voiceless and will show up with their power. If that doesn't break our hearts, I don't know what will.

We have a broken system that prioritizes the wealthy, corruption, and loyalty to President Trump over the health and well-being of people like Julie. There are 8.6 million people who will suffer because Republicans took their once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to cut Medicaid.

Republicans may be gleeful, but Americans will be tearful. Remember, congressional Republicans will lie over and over and say this is about rooting out fraud. No, it is not. It is about giving permanent tax cuts to the oligarchs. In fact, the top 20 percent of income earners will get 68 percent of the benefits in their bill.

Make no mistake that people will die as a result of these cuts. Families will suffer. Many will go broke thanks to medical bills, while millionaires get money for more yachts. Do they really need any more yachts?

Mr. Speaker, getting back to law enforcement, do you know the other

things that sheriffs in my district need to respond to crime and to keep people alive? They need rural hospitals. When Republicans strip \$715 billion from Medicaid, no matter how they try to paint that pig, they will be eliminating rural hospitals and emergency rooms.

When they do that, police officers in rural areas in places like Chama, New Mexico, in my district will have to drive 1½ to 2 hours to the nearest emergency room. Ask any first responder: The quicker somebody gets to an emergency room, the more likely they are to survive. When life or death is a matter of minutes, what Republicans are doing this week is deadly.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so concerned about crime in the country that the parting shot of Joe Biden on January 19 was to commute the sentences of 2,500 Federal defendants he claimed were "convicted of nonviolent drug offenses."

Let's look at that. We have a situation where he reduced the sentence of a Buffalo man, Lairon Graham, 67. In 2023, he was convicted of organizing and heading a drug conspiracy to sell fentanyl, crack cocaine, and heroin. When police raided his home, they found fentanyl, crack, and cash. He also possessed a firearm. In addition to heading up the drug gang, Graham was also convicted of sex trafficking by force or coercion from 2013 to 2021.

Of course, this is on top of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wanting to defend a Maryland man for being sent overseas after the guy was clearly moving people illegally, beating his girlfriend and wife, violating our laws, and here illegally. That is who they want to defend.

There are numerous other examples. Jaron Ruth, another Buffalo native, pleaded guilty in 2019 to selling drugs over a period of 3 years and possessing firearms. He had been charged with shooting a man in the chest during a burglary of the victim's home.

These are the kind of folks that Joe Biden was commuting as he exited stage left. We had another situation where he commuted the sentence of a gentleman who left prison after Biden commuted his sentence in the killing of two FBI agents. Is that who my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think they ought to be defending?

Can they answer the question of commuting the sentences of these violent criminals and putting them out on the streets, just as they voted against every measure we put forward to defend our borders and to stop the death and destruction of American citizens like Laken Riley or like Jocelyn Nungaray or those who have died at the hands of dangerous criminal cartels and gangs in our country?

What President Trump is doing is restoring the rule of law. What Republicans are doing is standing up in defense of law enforcement because we stand up in defense of the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FINE).

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the opportunity to speak today, and I think 4 minutes will turn out to be an appropriate amount of time.

My colleague on the other side talked about the nature of things being deadly. I would like to talk about that.

On April 17, less than 1 month ago, at 11:56 in the morning, a shooter carrying a gun walked onto the campus of Florida State University and began to shoot students and adults. It was a gun crime that we would all agree was horrific.

Mr. Speaker, I am new in this place. I only got elected here a month ago. What I will tell you of my observation of my first 4 weeks of being here is I hear a lot of canned speeches that don't actually address the bills and issues that the American people have sent us here to work on. I think it is why we may be held, to some degree, in such low regard.

During this shooting at 11:56 on April 17, seven people were shot. Fortunately, five were not killed. We only know one of them. She was a graduate student. The other names have not been released. In that shooting, two were killed.

Robert Morales was 57 years old and a dining coordinator at Florida State. Tiru Chabba was a vice president at the food service company at Florida State.

Why do I tell this story? Law enforcement at Florida State did everything right. They rushed to the scene. They subdued the shooter. Mr. Speaker, do you know how long it took them to do that? It took them 4 minutes, the amount of time that I will speak here today. In those 4 minutes, with law enforcement doing everything, seven people were shot, and two were killed.

H.R. 2243 would say that if any one of them were a retired or an off-duty law enforcement officer, they could have protected themselves.

When these horrific things happen, the fact of the matter is that it will take law enforcement time to get there. Mr. Speaker, the only way for you to defend yourself is for you to do it.

I am not saying that, had that bill passed, these seven people wouldn't have been shot. I don't know if there was retired law enforcement there. I don't know that any of these people were that.

I know that when shooters consider the places that they are going to go, one of the things they think about is what might be the response. When we tell people who have spent their entire careers and who are trained—not just anyone but someone who for their entire career gave themselves selflessly to protect us all, when we tell that per-

son because they are off-duty, because they are retired, all of that service is no longer useful, we needlessly put people at risk.

I don't want another shooting like we had at Florida State. God forbid, if there ever is another one, I want people there to respond. I am grateful to the law enforcement officers who took longer to get there than my speech will take, but I worry about what will happen next time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BACON for bringing this bill forward. I thank Representative ROY for giving me the opportunity to speak. We were told we should stand up for our citizens in this process. When we stand up to keep them safe, that is exactly what we are doing.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am really wondering what kind of people they want to defend over there. Let's talk about those pardons. Let's talk about the fact that this isn't something that happened over there. This happened in this Capitol. Those violent offenders were violent before they got there.

Let me talk about a couple of them. Do my colleagues want to defend Steven Cappuccio? He was convicted of six felonies, including assaulting a police officer.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, he was together with David Dempsey. David Dempsey was sentenced to 20 years. He stomped on a police officer's head, and he struck an officer in the head with a metal crutch.

This is the kind of person the Republicans want to defend.

Enrique Tarrio, a former national leader of the Proud Boys and a domestic terrorist, was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Guy Reffitt, somebody who brought a gun, zip ties, and body armor, was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Not only that, they have gone after their pardons, and they haven't stopped the criminal spree.

A Houston man was pardoned by Trump and then arrested on sex charges.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article titled: "Houston man pardoned by Trump arrested on child sex charge."

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

There was no objection.

HOUSTON MAN PARDONED BY TRUMP  
ARRESTED ON CHILD SEX CHARGE  
(By Robert Downen, Feb. 6, 2025)

Andrew Taake received a six-year sentence for assaulting officers on Jan. 6. He was arrested Thursday on an outstanding charge of soliciting a minor.

A Houston man who was recently pardoned by President Donald Trump for his role in the Jan. 6, 2021, insurrection has been arrested on an outstanding child sex crimes charge.

Andrew Taake, 36, was taken into custody on Thursday after spending more than two

weeks as a fugitive, the Harris County District Attorney's Office said. He had previously been charged with online solicitation of a minor stemming from a 2016 incident in which he allegedly sent sexually explicit messages to an undercover law enforcement officer who was posing as a 15-year-old girl.

Taake was among the roughly 1,600 people, including 120 Texans, who were charged for their roles in the U.S. Capitol riot, which ultimately resulted in five deaths, injuries to 140 police officers, at least \$2.8 million in damage and roughly 1,575 federal criminal cases.

Federal prosecutors said Taake used bear spray and a metal whip to assault officers, and that he was caught after bragging about the incident to a woman he met on an online dating app. Screenshots of his messages to the woman, who later alerted law enforcement, show that he sent a selfie of himself to the woman that he said was taken "about 30 minutes" after the incident, according to court records.

In June, he was sentenced to six years in prison after pleading guilty in 2023, but was released from federal prison in Colorado following Trump's sweeping Jan. 20 pardon of those charged for partaking in the melee.

Taake's release was condemned by Harris County District Attorney Sean Teare, who said that his office had faxed a copy of Taake's outstanding warrant to the Federal Bureau of Prisons five days before he was pardoned. After about two weeks on the lam, Taake was located and arrested at a residence in Leon County, Texas, the Harris County DA said Thursday.

Trump has referred to Jan. 6 defendants as "patriots" and "hostages," and said his mass pardon ends a "grave national injustice that has been perpetrated upon the American people." He and other Republicans have sought to frame the riot as a peaceful protest, and those charged for their roles as political prisoners.

But many—including at least 37 Texans—were charged with assault or other violent crimes. Others were members of extremist groups or militias, including Stewart Rhodes, the former Granbury resident and leader of the OathKeepers militia who was sentenced to 18 years in federal prison after a jury found him guilty of seditious conspiracy. Dozens more, including Taake, had prior convictions or pending charges for crimes such as rape, sexual abuse of a minor, domestic violence or production of child sexual abuse material, NPR reported last month.

Of the nearly 1,575 people charged in the riot, two-thirds pleaded guilty and roughly 250 were convicted by a judge or jury, according to NPR. Only four defendants were acquitted of all charges, and fourteen had their cases dismissed.

Texans played key roles in the insurrection. They helped craft Trump's attempts to overturn election results and were crucial to mainstreaming baseless election fraud conspiracies. On Jan. 6, a Texan was the first person to break into the Capitol, and Texas lawmakers have been among the loudest defenders of the riot and those involved in it.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. This happens over and over again. They seem unwilling to stand up for the Capitol Police whom they walk by every day.

They refuse to put up the plaque that is, by law, honoring them.

I wonder if they ever even say: I am sorry. I am sorry that President Trump pardoned the people who beat you.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I think it is really interesting that one of my colleagues from Florida just brought up a

terrible mass shooting that happened at Florida State University, which is horrible. Part of the reason I ran for Congress is to end gun violence.

When he brought up the shooting, I thought it was interesting because he left out one of the most important parts. He brought up that he never wants to see one of these shootings happen again, but he left out how the shooter got his gun.

The shooter got his gun from his stepmother, and it was a retired service weapon that was not kept in a safe way. He stole the gun, the retired service weapon, from his stepmother, and then he went to Florida State University and murdered two people and wounded six others.

Mr. Speaker, I bet you that that same gentleman who talked about that shooting is going to vote "yes" later on H.R. 2255 which I deeply oppose.

Just 1 month later, after this former service weapon was used to carry out a mass shooting and kill people at Florida State University, Republicans here in Congress are pushing the Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act, which would flood the gun market with even more former service weapons without any additional precautions, zero safe storage and zero background checks. In every State, a police officer would be able to purchase an older gun from their department at a discounted price.

House Republicans would not even consider my amendment to encourage caution by letting people hold law enforcement agencies accountable with what is done with the weapon. The United States already has the highest number of mass shootings in the world, and gun violence is the leading cause of death for children in this country.

So I am glad that one of my Republican colleagues from Florida wants to make sure that the shootings don't happen again.

Let's start by ensuring that we block this bill, H.R. 2255, so that way police officers don't even have to respond to a mass shooting in the first place. I am done with talking about how we are going to handle these things after they happen. Let's talk about how we are going to prevent these shootings from happening in the first place.

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

What I would notice, Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman complained about not having the amendment considered, but he offered the amendment about 1 hour before the Rules Committee met. So spare me the concern about whether or not we are considering amendments when we don't have the time to look at the amendment.

I would also note that when we are talking about these kinds of people, I went through a list of folks whom President Biden had commuted.

Here is another one. A Lubbock man, granted clemency by Biden, was arrested. The sheriff was absolutely angry about the former administra-

tion's decisions. The sheriff said that he felt angry after he found out a convicted criminal was being released back on the Lubbock streets early, that a convicted criminal is now back in law enforcement custody after violating his supervised release.

These are the kinds of folks whom we are putting back out on the streets, and we are having to arrest again the very people that President Biden put back out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCGUIRE).

Mr. MCGUIRE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the three bills it provides consideration for.

Since 2020 respect for law enforcement around our country has been on the decline, and we have seen the effects this has had in our communities.

We all know the best way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. In Chicago, criminals do not care about gun laws. They have the strictest gun laws and the most gun violence by criminals who don't care about gun laws. We need more good guys with guns on the street, mostly because Biden's open-border policy brought more illegal criminals into our country who are robbing, raping, and killing the American people.

In November the American people responded to this lack of respect in the polls. They elected the Republican majority in the House, the Senate, and the President in the White House who truly believes in law and order.

The three bills that the rule provides consideration for are commonsense bills. If we entrust law enforcement officers to uphold the laws of our Nation and risk their lives daily, then we should be able to entrust them to carry their weapons unrestricted off duty and to purchase their former service weapons.

Like many of my colleagues, I agree that we would not have a nation without those we entrust in uniform, whether they serve in the military, as first responders, or as law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women aren't honorable because of the badge they wear. They make the badge honorable because of the lives they live.

Every time I return to my district, I meet with the sheriffs of the 24 counties, cities, and towns I represent and hear directly from them about the troubles they face in the line of duty.

If we want to see safer streets and communities in our country, then we must ensure that we give law enforcement every tool possible so that they can make it through the day and return home safely.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I express my strong support for the rule and the underlying bills that it allows consideration for.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H. Con. Res. 33.

This measure will ensure that the plaque honoring the brave police officers who defended us on January 6 is hung in the Capitol as required by law.

Mr. Speaker, you know it is Police Week, but Republicans for some reason refuse to put up the plaque honoring the heroic efforts by U.S. Capitol Police and other local and Federal law officers who defended us and our democracy on January 6.

It is not a scary thing. The plaque looks like this.

Don't you agree, Mr. Speaker?

It is lovely. It recognizes their heroic efforts, and it is the law. It was signed into law by the President that this plaque goes up.

What are they afraid of?

Why don't they want to honor the Capitol Police and other law enforcement officers who were beaten and battered?

Why is their support for police conditional?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), to speak more to this resolution.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate Police Week, I join my colleagues in honoring law enforcement around the country and back home in Colorado.

On Capitol Hill, the men and women of the U.S. Capitol Police protect us and the seat of our democracy. I personally owe a great debt of gratitude to these officers who responded to the attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Many of my colleagues and I were trapped right up there in the House gallery that day as an insurrectionist mob converged on the Capitol. Officers from the Capitol Police, Metropolitan Police Department, and numerous other departments risked their lives to protect us and our democracy.

As seen here, these officers were brutally assaulted with flag poles, bear spray, stun guns, knives, and bats. Over 140 officers were wounded and sustained injuries from the attack. Many still deal with the mental and physical trauma from that day.

There were numerous officers who died from their injuries after the attack: Officer Brian Sicknick, Officer Howard Liebengood, Officer Jeffrey Smith, Officer Gunther Hashida, and Officer Kyle DeFreytag.

Congress, on a bipartisan basis, took a step to honor their extraordinary bravery when we passed a law in 2022 directing the placement of a plaque at the Capitol.

The plaque is complete. It is done. It has been sitting somewhere in storage in the Capitol, and it is way past time that we display this for America to see.

This Police Week let's honor the men and women who bravely risked everything to do their duty to protect this House and to protect this Capitol and our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in doing the right thing. It is time to display this plaque so Americans around the country who visit the seat of this democracy will see and be able to join us in honoring the bravery of those men and women from January 6, 2021.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note that as we are considering this Police Week and we are talking about the safety and security of our streets, I would just note that two of our most dangerous States as measured by violent crime and property crime rates are the States of New Mexico and Colorado, which also happen to have Democrats controlling all levels of power.

I would note that last summer, the good people of Aurora, Colorado, were dealing with Tren de Aragua, who were engaging in violent activities in apartment complexes and demonstrating the violence that has led to the death of Americans, and the trafficking of dangerous narcotics and fentanyl. They literally took over their homes. I met with and talked to Cindy Romero from Aurora about what happened to her in her home and that my Democratic colleagues weren't even acknowledging that it was happening. They were just ignoring it.

Then Tren de Aragua moved to San Antonio and other places across the country. I want to give a shout-out to the Texas Department of Public Safety and all the great local law enforcement in Hays County, Texas. That is because just literally last week they converged together with the FBI to go identify and stop 47 individuals. Probably 14 of whom were a part of Tren de Aragua from all over the country. They had come into Austin to coordinate. They had drugs, narcotics, and children in a home near where I live in Dripping Springs, Texas.

Thanks to law enforcement we now have removed at least four of those individuals and are prosecuting others because we now have a law enforcement community who knows that the President of the United States is backing them, and a Republican House and a Republican Senate are backing them.

Local law enforcement are being backed instead of having leftist judges who are dismissing the crimes and putting dangerous criminals on the streets. When Joe Biden commutes sentences and puts dangerous criminals on the streets, the American people know who is actually standing up for law enforcement.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I find it incredibly ironic when my colleague talks about President Trump backing law enforcement.

Last night in the Rules Committee, their Republican colleague, Mr. KNOTT,

noted that Republicans have not increased or passed legislation for law enforcement in the 119th Congress.

When Republicans back law enforcement, they should actually be passing the funding to support State law enforcement, to support that collaboration and coordination. At the same time we are seeing that Republicans are not saying a peep about the fact that President Trump is cutting existing resources.

Not only does he plan to cut the budget for law enforcement, he is cutting resources today. He has terminated \$820 million worth of grants for public safety. He has cut \$169 million in funding for community safety and violence reduction programs. He has cut \$71.7 million in grants to policing and prosecution programs, including longstanding efforts to address violent crimes and acts of targeted violence.

It doesn't terminate there. The Trump administration terminated grants for policing and prosecution, for victim services, for juvenile justice and child protection, for substance abuse and mental health treatment, for correction, and for protecting and serving the women who have been raped and the children who have been abused. He has cut that funding.

I have spoken to the women who are administering those programs and who have called me in tears because the children they serve will not be receiving those Federal grants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this issue of the pardons that my colleague has referred to.

Once again, let's go back and think about how they have not objected to the pardons of the January 6, nor have they called for putting up the plaque to honor the law enforcement who served us that day.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, which I will propose if the previous question is denied, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, both Democrats and Republicans should be forever grateful to the police officers who protected this Capitol as an angry, racist, violent mob came in. We will forever remember the 140 officers who were injured and the five officers who lost their lives as a result, including Brian Sicknick, a Capitol Police Officer; Howard Liebengood, a Capitol Police Officer; and Metropolitan Police Department Officers Jeffrey Smith, Gunther Hashida, and Kyle DeFreitag.

I am also grateful to those officers that testified in front of the January 6th Committee, including Michael Fanone, Officer Harry Dunn, Police Sergeant Aquilino Gonell, and Officer Daniel Hodges.

It has been more than 2 years, Mr. Speaker—take a look at this plaque—that the other side has failed to properly honor police officers. Yet, they stand here and want to dictate to us how supportive they are of the men and women in police departments across this country. They have failed to put this plaque up to properly honor those men and women that protected our lives as an angry, racist mob came into this building and chanted: “hang Mike Pence.” Let's kill NANCY PELOSI. That is what they intended to do, and you failed to recognize the police officers that protected all of us, Democrat and Republican.

As the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, I am more than willing to work with the Architect of the Capitol and Republican leadership to make sure that we honor our police officers, and this Police Week it is important that we do that.

What do we get from the White House? We get a pardon of very violent people that wanted to hurt all of us.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to say to the Republican leadership that they must honor police officers in the proper way, particularly those of them that gave their lives for us and the American public. Let's do this. It has been years now since they refused to do this, and yet they call themselves the party of law and order.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, a vote on the previous question is a vote to protect the police.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

If we talk about standing up in defense of police, how can my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say with a straight face that that is what they want to do when we had one Democrat from New York who said: I am not in favor of more police; I am actually in favor of defunding the police. We had another Congresswoman from New York who said: Defunding police means defunding police. I can go back, and the RECORD is replete with examples of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle calling for defunding the police. In fact, one of my colleagues from Texas was literally serving on the Austin City Council when they cut \$150 million out of the Austin Police Department's budget, leaving their academy decimated, leaving them unable to field 911 calls, leaving violent crimes skyrocketing in the city of Austin, because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were patently clear about their desire to defund the police and

side with violent mobs in the summer of 2020, when our cities were burning across the country.

Yes, we are standing up for the men and women in blue. Yes, we will defend them, but, no, we are not going to blindly support grants that are being used by NGOs to undermine the very police they are saying they are trying to support. For example, one grant to an NGO that was promoting prostitution and open borders, this is the kind of stuff that the American people sent us here to stop. This is the kind of stuff that they are proud of the President for using DOGE to identify and stop.

Yes, we are trying to defund those particularly bad grant programs, while we try to make sure that our local jurisdictions can fund police properly and have judges that will actually put bad guys in jail instead of letting them on the streets and a President that won't commute the sentences of 2,500 people, dozens or hundreds of whom were violent criminals and are now back out on the streets.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague has mentioned all kinds of words and ideas, and he is putting all kinds of stuff out there, but he has not once mentioned the plaque.

The previous question is: Will you honor the police who defended us in this Chamber by doing a simple thing? That is putting up this plaque.

Mr. Speaker, what counts on the floor of this House is your vote. Let's look at what those votes have resulted in. Those votes say we should honor the police who suffered when the insurrectionists beat them, that we should honor the police who protected our democracy and indeed protected every single one of us. Whether you are Republican or Democrat, a House Member or a Senator, you were protected by the police.

Are you willing to vote for this? If you vote against the previous question, you are saying we will not do this simple act of respect.

Now, let's get to the idea of what did you actually vote on.

Democrats have the receipts. For fiscal year 2023, the last year that Democrats wrote the appropriations bill, we increased funding for grants to State and local law enforcement by \$506 billion. All but nine House Republicans voted against that bill.

Remember, it is not what you say. It is what you do. What did you vote for? Democrats put forward bills to increase funding, and Republicans voted against it.

We also increased funding for the FBI by half a billion dollars. I already went through how important the FBI is for Tribal law enforcement; how much our rural and local officers rely on them to do the investigation. They have access to technology that our sheriffs do not. The FBI supports law enforcement in Indian country.

We need these resources, and I am incredibly insulted when the gentleman, my good friend from Texas, my neighbor, actually says of local law enforcement that these programs are a waste. Go and talk to the people who rely on them. They are not duplicative. They are not a waste. They are essential.

Let me do just one last little fact check on that. When you look at who has the most homicides and some of the highest crime rates, it is indeed Republican States. Yes, it is unfortunate, and it is something we need to work on. Democrats raise this issue all the time, but the highest levels of crime and homicides are—let me go through those States—Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, sadly, New Mexico, Missouri, Arkansas, South Carolina. See a little trend there? It is actually Republicans. Don't come and talk to us about that. It is dangerous to live and work in many Republican-led States.

Let's get back to what we do to honor and respect law enforcement on this Police Week.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard a lot of claims today, but here is what remains true. Democrats support law enforcement, not just with words, but with action, with our votes. We back them with funding, with resources, and, importantly, with respect.

That is why, under Democratic leadership, we increased funding for local and Federal law enforcement, including the very FBI that solves crimes in our rural and Tribal communities.

We don't just say these things. We show up for law enforcement. We stand with the Capitol Police who defended our democracy and our lives on January 6. We honor their courage. We mourn those who died, and we refuse to excuse the violent criminals who attacked them.

Unfortunately, too many of our Republican colleagues have chosen loyalty to Donald Trump over loyalty to the truth and over loyalty to the officers who keep us safe. You cannot say you support and respect law enforcement and stay silent as Trump pardons the violent criminals who battered the police on January 6. You can't say you support law enforcement when you refuse to do something as simple as hanging a plaque to honor their sacrifices.

While Republicans hold up empty slogans, Democrats fight for the health and dignity of the American people. We fought all night long to protect 8.6 million Americans from losing Medicaid, for the mother caring for a child with disabilities. We fought to protect the senior in rural New Mexico who has to drive hours just to see a doctor and will have to drive hours more when their Medicaid cuts destroy our world healthcare system. Why? So Repub-

licans can hand out tax cuts to billionaires.

Do the millionaires and billionaires you are protecting really need more? They already have so much. They will drown and bury the veteran, the pregnant mother, the disabled worker with paperwork while they will just give away a bigger tax cut to the wealthiest among us. That just doesn't seem fair.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this is about values. This is about who do you value and what will you do when it actually comes down to vote?

Democrats value and choose to protect people like Julie, who crawled up these Capitol steps 35 years ago to demand dignity and now returns to beg us not to be forgotten. We are not forgetting her, and Democrats will not stop fighting for her and for millions more.

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

Mr. ROY. May I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my Republican colleagues for bringing forward legislation in support of our law enforcement community.

I am proud of the fact that, in fact, this President is trying to focus resources where it will best provide security and safety on our streets and back our law enforcement community to actually target criminals, not fund ridiculous grants, not fund NGOs that are undermining our security, the very NGOs that are perpetuating the open borders; that are putting gangs in our communities, like TDA and MS-13, that lead directly to the death of Americans, death of Americans like Jocelyn Nungaray, like Laken Riley, like Rachel Morin, like Kayla Hamilton; Americans that are no longer with us because of the policies of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because of wide-open borders, and because of tolerance of violent criminals, because of a Democrat President who has let violent criminals out on the street and commuted their sentences; because of radical leftist judges promoted by those that fund my colleagues on the other side of the aisle; like George Soros who have funded DAS that are letting criminals out on the streets in cities like San Antonio and Austin that I represent; like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that have defunded the police time and time again and have defended that position.

For example, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that 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.

Another colleague said that the defund movement isn't new. Folks are just finally listening.

Defund the police, said a Democrat colleague.

Defunding the police isn't radical. It is real, said a former Democrat colleague and, as I said before, a colleague that literally voted on the Austin City Council to strip \$150 million out of the police budget, leaving the Austin Police stranded, unable to do their job and the people of Austin unable to get the services that they deserve and pay taxes for, while their streets are made more violent and while criminals are allowed to roam free under the very aforementioned Soros DAs that refused to prosecute the criminals.

□ 1300

Everybody in America knows what is going on. Everybody in America gets the joke. They saw their cities burning in the summer of 2020. They saw the reality of what happens when you allow these radical Democratic policies to take root, and they want it to end.

They want common sense back. They want a President who will enforce the law and an FBI that will target criminals instead of the American people. They don't want to have a Federal Government that is weaponized against them. They don't want them to be targeted.

They want violent criminals off the streets. They want violent gangs off the streets. They want our borders to be secure. They want TDA out. They want MS-13 out. They want fentanyl off their streets.

The only way you can do that is to actually back up the people trying to enforce the law and actually stand with them in the enforcement of the law, not turn around and let all the criminals back out on the streets. Yet, that is what my colleagues perpetually want to do.

The fact of the matter is, the American people understand that this President, this Republican House, this Republican Senate, and Republican jurisdictions across the country stand for law enforcement. They stand for order. That is what they want. That is what they sent us here for.

We put together some bills this week that are focused on wishes of the people, the men and women in blue, like my grandfather, who served as chief of police in Sweetwater, Texas, and the many law enforcement I was proud to serve with and alongside in the Office of the Attorney General of Texas and in the United States Attorney's Office. We work with them on a regular basis.

When you talk to them, they cannot do their jobs if the radical leftist policies of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are allowed to continue to be perpetuated. You can't combat crime if you put the criminals back on the streets. You can't combat crime if you import criminals from dangerous prisons. You can't combat crime if your law enforcement agencies are targeting American citizens for political retribution rather than taking dangerous, violent criminals off the streets.

I rise in support of these bills. I rise in support of the rule. The legislation that we put forward will provide the value for our men and women in uniform that they have asked for. They have asked for the ability to keep the weapons that they had in service.

Why does that matter? I will tell you why it matters. My grandfather that I mentioned before died in 1949 of cancer. When my dad, a 7-year-old, had polio and my grandmother was a single mom in west Texas raising him and did all the tough things, didn't ask for any handouts, took two jobs, helped my dad go on to be the first to go to college—my dad is 82 years old. He is still alive. He is 82 and still manages to walk, barely.

My dad talks about his dad as a cop, and he pulls out his old .38, the .38 revolver that my grandfather had in service. That means something to the people who serve. It means something for them to be able to carry that with them and take it with them. It is no small thing.

Some of my colleagues dismiss it as not being important. I can tell you it is important to the people who are out there serving because they devote their lives to this cause.

When I take that .38 out of the safe and show it to my son, he is holding the .38 that his great-grandfather held and carried with him when he was policing the streets. I think that is a good thing.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 405 OFFERED BY  
Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 33) directing the Architect of the Capitol to install at a permanent location on the western front of the United States Capitol an honorific plaque listing the names of all of the officers of the United States Capitol Police, the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and protective entities who responded to the violence that occurred at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees.

SEC 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 33.

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

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

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## 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 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

## AFTER RECESS

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2215;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 405; and

Adoption of House Resolution 405, if ordered.

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

## SALEM MARITIME NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK REDESIGNATION AND BOUNDARY STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2215) to redesignate the Salem Maritime National Historic Site as the "Salem Maritime National Historical Park", and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 31, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—382

Adams	Amo	Babin
Aderholt	Amodei (NV)	Bacon
Aguilar	Ansari	Baird
Alford	Arrington	Balderson
Allen	Auchincloss	Balint