

and Donald Trump incited a violent insurrection against us, we would, in bipartisan unison, denounce it and vote to impeach and convict.

Ten Republicans did join all the Democrats in doing that. That was historic. Seven Republican Senators voted to convict after seeing overwhelming evidence.

MITCH MCCONNELL also found the evidence completely convincing, but he said that he didn't think the Senate has jurisdiction to try to convict a former President, despite the fact that that contradicted two centuries of precedent, and the Senate ruled on the very first day against that motion to dismiss the charges. He said there was nothing that could be done, even though Donald Trump was actually, factually, ethically, and morally responsible for everything that happened.

When will my colleagues finally break from the cultish obedience to Donald Trump, who is now over in the Middle East on what looks like a business trip for him and his family? They are all raking in not just hundreds of millions of dollars but billions of dollars with their business deals.

My colleagues are back home doing his bidding, trying to slash \$888 billion from Medicaid and the programs that the American people have built. Our parents and grandparents built those programs so we can take care of ourselves.

The richest man in the world and Donald Trump have another agenda. They have left your agenda behind. They left you guys to do the dirty work.

Donald Trump is collecting a \$400 million flying grift gift from Qatar. They are giving him bribery force one. Nobody has ever seen anything like this in the history of the United States. They are trying to give him a jet plane.

It is humiliating for the American President to be flying around in a plane created by the dictator, the theocratic monster of Qatar, while they are collecting billions of dollars. His son-in-law, Jared Kushner, has gotten \$2 billion from Saudi Arabia.

This is totally in violation of the Constitution. Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 says that nobody holding an office of trust under the United States shall, without the consent of the Congress, collect a "present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign state."

That is Donald Trump's new business, to go collect foreign government emoluments.

I hope my colleagues will join us in demanding that he come to Congress to ask for permission to keep that \$400 million bug-riddled airplane that he wants to fly around on somebody else's tab. It is absurd, the lengths that they have gone to, to mangle and trample our Constitution.

Let's get back to law enforcement and the rule of law, starting with the

Constitution of the United States of America. The President wants to keep all of these gifts from foreign dictators. Come to Congress.

That is what Abraham Lincoln did. The King of Siam gave Abraham Lincoln elephant tusks. This is in the middle of the Civil War. Check out the descent of honor and integrity in our country. In the middle of the Civil War, President Lincoln comes to Congress and says: Can I keep those elephant tusks? Congress comes back with a message: We love you, Honest Abe. You are doing a great job in the war, but no. Turn those over to the Department of the Interior.

My colleagues will not even demand that Donald Trump bring his corrupt gifts, his royal spoils, to the Congress of the United States to ask our consent. Every President has done it up until this one.

Let's get back to the rule of law. Let's enforce the Constitution. Let's honor the police officers who defended us. Let's stay away from bills that just put a lot more guns into traffic to make life more dangerous for police officers and for everybody in America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2255, the Federal Law Enforcement Officer Service Weapon Purchase Act, is a very commonsense piece of legislation supported by Republicans and, at least last Congress, by 13 Democrats, as well. Fourteen Members across the aisle voted in favor of this same exact bill, and I encourage more Members to do so as we honor police this week and into the future.

Law enforcement officers are faced with danger every single day, not only on the job, but when they return to their homes. This commonsense bill honors them a little bit and shows them that we want them to have these weapons in their homes to protect them, their property, and their families, as well.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RASKIN. 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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 195. An act to amend the Visit America Act to promote music tourism, and for other purposes.

S. 260. An act to amend the Bottles and Breastfeeding Equipment Screening Act to require hygienic handling of breast milk and baby formula by security screening personnel of the Transportation Security Administration and personnel of private security companies, providing security screening, and for other purposes.

S. 1596. An act to rename the Anahuac National Wildlife Refuge located in the State of Texas as the "Jocelyn Nungaray National Wildlife Refuge".

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106-567, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board:

Carter Burwell of Virginia.

#### IMPROVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SAFETY AND WELLNESS THROUGH DATA ACT

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 405, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2240

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act".*

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*Congress finds the following:*

(1) There has been a rise in anti-police rhetoric and a corresponding rise in violence against law enforcement officers.

(2) In 2022, a total of 60 police officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty.

(3) Nearly 30 percent of police officer killings in 2022 were caused by unprovoked attacks or ambushes on officers.

(4) Law enforcement officers bravely put themselves at risk for the betterment of society.

(5) A data collection that represents the full circumstances surrounding violent attacks and

ambush attacks on law enforcement officers is vital for the provision of needed Federal resources to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

(6) Police suffer assaults and other offenses that do not rise to the level of Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted or National Incident-Based Reporting System reporting due to the frequency of such incidents, lower risk to officers, and minimal administrative resources to report such frequent events.

(7) The mental health of law enforcement officers has suffered due to overwork, recruitment issues, and the general stress of their work.

(8) The people of the United States will always remember the victims of these hateful attacks against law enforcement officers and stand in solidarity with individuals affected by these senseless tragedies and incidents of hate that have affected law enforcement communities and their families.

(9) The United States must demonstrate to its brave law enforcement officers that they are important, valued, and respected.

(10) Congress has made a commitment to helping communities protect the lives of their police officers, as evidenced by the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-155; 130 Stat. 389) and other laws.

(11) Subsection (c) of the Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act of 1988 (34 U.S.C. 41303(c)) requires the Attorney General to “acquire, collect, classify, and preserve national data on Federal criminal offenses as part of the Uniform Crime Reports” and requires all Federal departments and agencies that investigate criminal activity to “report details about crime within their respective jurisdiction to the Attorney General in a uniform matter and on a form prescribed by the Attorney General”.

### SEC. 3. ATTACKS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, and the Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) the number of offenders that intentionally target law enforcement officers because of their status as law enforcement officers;

(2) the number of incidents reported to the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection that occur through the coordinated actions of 2 or more parties;

(3) a description of the Federal response to ambushes and violent attacks on Federal law enforcement officers;

(4) a detailed survey of what State and local responses are to ambushes and violent attacks on State and local law enforcement officers;

(5) recommendations for improving State, local, and Federal responses to ambushes and violent attacks on law enforcement officers;

(6) a detailed survey of Federal and State-based training programs that law enforcement officers receive in preparation for violent attacks, including ambush attacks;

(7) an analysis of the effectiveness of the programs described in paragraph (6) in preparing law enforcement officers for violent attacks, including ambush attacks;

(8) recommendations on how to improve State, local, and Federal training programs for law enforcement officers relating to ambush attacks;

(9) an analysis of, with respect to the Patrick Leahy Bulletproof Vest Partnership under part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10530 et seq.)—

(A) the efficacy of the Partnership in distributing protective gear to law enforcement officers

across the United States, including any location-specific limitations to the distribution under such Partnership; and

(B) the general limitations of the Partnership, including any location-specific limitations to the distributions under the Partnership, considering the fact that law enforcement officers are suffering from ambush attacks;

(10) an analysis of the ability of the Department of Justice to combine the Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection and a 09C Justifiable Homicide report for officer-involved shooting reports and any roadblocks to producing a clear report with such information;

(11) an analysis of the ability of the Criminal Justice Information Services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to expand data collection to include a suspect offender's level of injury at the time of a reported Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Data Collection incident;

(12) an analysis of the existence and extent of, and reasons for, disparities in the availability and reporting of data between—

(A) data relating to ambush attacks against law enforcement officers; and

(B) other types of violent crime data; and

(13) an analysis of any additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in deterring ambush attacks against law enforcement officers.

(b) *DEVELOPMENT.*—In developing the report required under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, and the Director of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

### SEC. 4. AGGRESSION AGAINST LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) an analysis of the ability to implement a new category in the Uniform Crime Reporting System and the National Incident-Based Reporting System on aggressive actions, conduct, or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, are not reported in such systems;

(2) the level of detail the category described in paragraph (1) would include and the standard of evidence that would be used for any reported incidents;

(3) an analysis of how to engage State and local law enforcement agencies in reporting the data described in paragraph (1), despite the fact that such data is beyond the standard crime-based reporting to the systems described in paragraph (1);

(4) an analysis of potential uses by the Department of Justice and any component agencies of the Department of Justice of the data described in paragraph (1);

(5) an analysis of the existence and extent of, and reasons for, disparities in the availability and reporting of data between—

(A) data relating to aggressive actions or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers that do not rise to the level of crimes; and

(B) other types of violent crime data; and

(6) an analysis of additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary

to assist in deterring aggressive actions, conduct, or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers.

(b) *DEVELOPMENT.*—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

### SEC. 5. MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the types, frequency, and severity of mental health and stress-related responses of law enforcement officers to aggressive actions or other trauma-inducing incidents against law enforcement officers;

(2) mental health and stress-related resources or programs that are available to law enforcement officers at the Federal, State, and local levels, especially peer-to-peer programs;

(3) the extent to which law enforcement officers use the resources or programs described in paragraph (2);

(4) the availability of, or need for, mental health screening within Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; and

(5) additional legislative tools or authorities that may be helpful or necessary to assist in assessing, monitoring, and improving the mental health and wellness of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers.

(b) *DEVELOPMENT.*—In developing the report required under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal and local law enforcement agencies; and

(2) nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, academics, or other entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY) and the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. McBATH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2240.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, police officers risk their lives every day to protect our communities. I extend my sincere gratitude to all law enforcement officers and their families for their service and sacrifice.

Unfortunately, law enforcement officers face the continued threat of unprovoked and ambush-style attacks. The bill before us, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, would require the Attorney General to develop a series of reports related to violent attacks on law enforcement officers.

The left's defund the police movement continues to have ripple effects throughout the country, as violent crime remains high and criminals have become more brazen in their attacks against police officers.

In addition, rogue prosecutors and leftwing bail reform policies continue to allow more criminals on the street with no accountability.

Let me be clear: The threat to officer safety is very real, and we must take a stand against any defund the police rhetoric.

In 2024, 342 officers were killed in the line of duty, with 79 of them shot in 61 ambush-style attacks. As of May 1, 2025, 109 officers have been shot in the line of duty just this year.

This violence against law enforcement is unacceptable and underscores the importance of this legislation.

While the government collects basic information on these attacks, such as when the attack occurred and what types of weapons are used, more information is needed to help law enforcement officers prepare for, identify, and prevent future anti-police activity.

This legislation would also shed light on the mental health consequences of the attacks on law enforcement and other trauma law enforcement deals with on a daily basis. Mental health resources are another critical need for law enforcement officers, as they continue to risk their lives every day to keep their communities safe.

We must take care of those who do so much to take care of us.

This legislation is common sense. It will gather more information to help Congress explore the best possible solutions for our law enforcement officers.

I would like to mention that 146 of my colleagues across the aisle voted in favor of this legislation last Congress. It is incredibly bipartisan.

Let's all work together to stand against attacks on law enforcement and support our men and women in blue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this crucial legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act.

Law enforcement officers serve as our lifeline of defense against danger. With this bill, we have an opportunity to equip the Department of Justice and Congress with very crucial information to better understand and enhance officer safety.

Law enforcement officers deserve to return home safely to their families,

knowing their well-being is truly a priority. Federal, State, local, and Tribal officers face very long hours, immense pressure, and unpredictable dangers every day. Over time, the constant strain of the job can take a significant toll on their bodies and minds.

While there are some mental health resources currently available to our officers, there is still so much more that we can and should be doing to ensure their wellness and, most definitely, their safety.

By prioritizing data-driven approaches to officer safety and wellness, we can address systemic risks, reduce preventable tragedies, and build a stronger, more resilient law enforcement system.

The goal is that the required report will provide us with insight into the challenges our officers face and help us to understand the additional support that they need to remain physically and mentally safe.

Federal law enforcement officers dedicate themselves to protecting our Nation, to protecting our communities, and it is our responsibility in this body to ensure that they receive the protection that they deserve.

□ 1315

Law enforcement officers face unparalleled risks every day, from physical violence to psychological traumas. According to the FBI, assaults against officers remain very, very high, with tens of thousands of them who are injured annually.

Beyond the line of duty, officers experience higher rates of PTSD, depression, and suicide compared to the general population. Yet, for too long, this body, Congress, has not done as much as we should to tackle these issues that they face.

This bill requires the collection and analysis of critical data on attacks on officers, injuries that they suffer, their mental health challenges, and wellness program effectiveness. Without accurate data, we are fighting blind.

By identifying trends, such as the frequency of attacks on officers or gaps in mental health support, we can implement targeted solutions to keep our officers safe and to keep them healthy.

Many officer fatalities and injuries are preventable with better training, better equipment, and better policies. For example, if data reveals that a significant number of injuries occurred during traffic stops, agencies can adopt safer tactics or deploy new technologies. If certain regions report higher rates of firearm-related fatalities, we can prioritize resources there.

Officer suicide rates outpace line-of-duty deaths. I will say this again: Officer suicide rates outpace line-of-duty deaths. Yet, stigma and inadequate resources prevent many of them from seeking help. This bill will help us track mental health trends, evaluate the effectiveness of peer support programs, and expand access to counseling. Healthy officers are better offi-

cers. They are more effective officers, both for their own well-being and for the communities that they serve.

When officers are safer, healthier, and better supported, they are better equipped to serve with professionalism and with empathy. Our communities benefit when law enforcement agencies are operating using data to improve practices rather than reacting to crises.

Yet, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act isn't just about gathering data and reporting statistics. It is about lives, and it is about public safety. It is about the officer who returns home safely to their family at night. It is about the rookie who gets lifesaving training, or the veteran who receives mental health care instead of suffering in silence.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to realize any of these benefits, this bill must be the first step that we take and definitely not the last. We must be prepared to act on the information that we get from these reports that come from this bill, much of which is already collected by the DOJ and other agencies. We must be prepared to provide tangible resources to our law enforcement, which I am sure the reports will suggest that they need.

As we observe National Police Week and talk about officer safety and wellness, I would be remiss if I did not call for the immediate restoration of hundreds of millions of dollars that are affecting nearly 40 States in public safety grant funding that the Department of Justice chose to abruptly terminate. Some of that canceled funding went to law enforcement training; support and other critical resources; and, more specifically, to addressing the health, safety, and wellness of law enforcement.

As I have here, President Trump's 2026 budget would have devastating impacts on public policy by cutting \$1 billion across 40 Department of Justice grant programs which support police departments and reduce violent crime, hate crime, and crime against women.

Mr. Speaker, \$646 million from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, for violence and terrorism has been terminated. I can go on and on, but I won't.

These terminations include a grant totaled at over \$8 million to the National Policing Institute, which assisted rural police departments and district attorneys' offices to pay for violent crime investigators and programs to combat child sex abuse.

I also feel that it is necessary to mention once again, as the ranking member has, the plaque that we voted to hang in the Capitol more than 3 years ago to honor the countless officers who fought—and they died—to protect the lives of Members of Congress, all of us in this body. They not only fought to protect Members of Congress but staffers and other personnel and to save our democracy on January 6, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, hanging this plaque is the least that we could do to honor those who have fought and died and given their lives for us, this body. Hanging this plaque is required by law, a law that was passed. We passed the law over 3 years ago.

Why is this plaque not up? That is a simple question. Why is this law being defied? That is a simple question.

Many of those officers have been left feeling ignored and betrayed by the very same Members of Congress. They stand outside every single day to protect and watch over us. They feel betrayed.

Many times, they can't even look at us as we walk out the door because they feel betrayed. They fought to protect us on that day, January 6, and, yes, we still betray them.

Former U.S. Capitol Police Sergeant Aquilino Gonell recently told our staff: Trump is treating the rioters like they were the ones defending the Capitol.

He went on to say of Trump: Calling January 6 "a day of love," if that was a day of love, "They almost 'loved' me to death."

If we really intend to support our officers, they should not be feeling this level of betrayal and disappointment in the government that they swore to defend and protect. Officers who put their lives on the line for us deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a point of privilege to say that when I lost my son, Jordan, in Jacksonville, Florida, on November 23, 2012, at a convenience store gas station by a man who never should have had a gun, that convenience store family, the owners, at least had the decency to put a plaque up in remembrance of my slain son, who was simply stopping to get some chewing gum as he was going from one mall to the next with his friends. They at least had the decency, and my son wasn't doing anything to protect the Nation or protect Members of Congress. Yet and still, out of dignity and respect for someone who was slain unnecessarily, they at least had the decency to put up a plaque in remembrance of my son.

We should no less do that for these folks who stand here every single day. They would take bullets for us. Let's do the right thing. Why would we not honor them? We can't say one thing and do another, that we want to serve and protect them. We want to make their lives better. The American people are watching us. They are depending on us.

Mr. Speaker, let's do the right thing. Simply just put this plaque out for all of us, for their service to us and to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, while I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, I also urge them to do more than just collect data and request reports from other officials. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MOORE), my good friend and the bill's primary sponsor.

Mr. MOORE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2240, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, a bill that I introduced in response to the deeply troubling rise in targeted violence against our Nation's law enforcement.

Every day, officers across this great Nation put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Far too often, they, in fact, become the targets of violence simply for wearing the badge. This year alone—this year alone, again—we are only in May—there have been 109 officers shot in the line of duty, 12 of whom tragically lost their lives.

Mr. Speaker, even more alarming is there have been 21 ambush-style attacks on law enforcement officers this year, resulting in 25 officers shot, 5 of whom were killed. These numbers do not account, though, even for the many instances where officers were fired upon but, fortunately, were not struck.

Mr. Speaker, ambush-style attacks are some of the most dangerous. They are calculated and often deadly, leading to higher rates of both injuries and fatalities. That is why I introduced this legislation to ensure that we are doing all that we can at the Federal level to understand, prevent, and respond to these targeted attacks.

The Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act enhances our ability to collect and, more importantly, to analyze data on violent acts against officers. This will empower agencies around the country with the information that they need to strengthen their responses and better protect their personnel.

Importantly, H.R. 2240 also calls for a comprehensive assessment of availability and use of mental health resources within law enforcement because protecting those who protect us must include supporting their mental well-being. We need to make sure that we get away from any shame that can sometimes happen when a law enforcement officer needs to reach out for some kind of mental health counseling.

If the Speaker would think about it, these men and women oftentimes see the worst of folks. They see folks who are in their worst state. They see the tragedies that hopefully most of us will go through life and never have to see, and they do it every day, day in and day out, because it is their job that they have chosen to do to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, these officers answer the call, day or night. They don't have a choice as to what they respond to. They run toward danger to safeguard our neighborhoods, and far too often, they pay a heavy price. We owe them more than our gratitude. We owe them action.

Mr. Speaker, I say this: There were a couple of comments about past events, some which happened before I came here as a new Member. Yet, I do re-

member very well the spring of 2020, when we saw many of our cities burned, looted, and destroyed. Some of them have not yet even recovered. Instead of law enforcement being supported by some in those local governments, they were vilified when they were out doing what they could to try to help. They were told to stand down and allow mobs to go in and destroy property.

I saw that firsthand, Mr. Speaker, in Raleigh. I literally watched folks roaming around and destroying windows, burning vehicles, shooting, all this kind of mayhem. I won't mention names, but I saw some colleagues on the other side who would kind of give cover and say: Well, it was understandable. It was a peaceful protest.

It is not a peaceful protest if you are destroying buildings. It is not a peaceful protest if you are attacking someone. It is not a peaceful protest if you are burning buildings, burning cars, and engaging in violent conduct.

Then we saw from that some of this antipolice that came about, the calls to defund the police. I am glad to see that I don't hear that very much anymore. I hope that foolish idea never gets raised again in this great Chamber because if it were not for the men and women in law enforcement, it would be a society of disorder and random violence. We owe these men and women all that we can do for them. We owe it to them to make sure that their jobs are safe.

Mr. Speaker, I think about a situation that happened in Wake County, North Carolina, in 2022, where a sheriff's deputy was ambushed and killed by an illegal immigrant. I am not trying to open up the debate on illegal immigration. Fortunately, this body has taken action, along with our President, to secure the border and to stop gang members from coming into this country.

Yet, someone who was in this country who shouldn't have even been here attacked and ambushed a Wake County deputy and killed him. These stories happen around the country.

This is one more piece—one more piece—in finally bringing some sanity, bringing some protection and providing protection for the American people, to make sure that they are not having to worry about gang members being allowed into the country, that we are not allowing illegal immigration to run amuck, and that we are not downing the police and somehow lifting up the criminals.

The American people were tired of that. They were tired of it. And guess what? They are getting results. This is one more piece to try to do this to help these men and women in law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the body's support. I encourage all of the Members to vote for it.

□ 1330

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCBATH for her extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, which seeks to improve law enforcement officer safety and wellness by requiring that the AG and other Federal officials issue regular reports on attacks on police officers, aggression against police officers, and on officer mental health.

I salute Mr. FRY, a freshman to this body, for his stewardship of this bill. The collection of this information is important and useful, but the mere passive gathering of data does little or nothing to actually improve officer effectiveness or public safety.

In fact, none of the bills we have considered from the majority during this law enforcement week would actually produce any measurable gains in public safety.

We spent the week voting for bills that will do nothing really but increase the number of weapons on our streets, our buses, our trains, our subways, parks, restaurants, and in our schools. That is a strange way to improve public safety or aid law enforcement in doing their jobs.

Now, there are things we can actually do to improve public safety.

Mr. Speaker, forgive me. I know Mr. FRY is in his second term, not in his first term. He is a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman to speak said he never wanted to hear about defunding the police again, and I agree with him completely.

The problem is, he is about to hear about it because DOGE is defunding the police as we speak and, unfortunately, with your cooperation and your passivity, they are getting away with it.

Now, this self-anointed fourth branch of government, DOGE, which I think is getting run out of town right now because of its rank incompetence and lawless assaults on the privacy data of hundreds of millions of Americans and its unlawful summary mass firings of professional civil servants like air traffic controllers, food and drug inspectors, pediatric cancer researchers in my district, Forest Service, and firefighters. They are getting run out of town now. I don't hear a lot about Elon Musk. He has lost some elections for my friends across the aisle, so they are trying to let him sink into anonymity, but he has done his damage.

Over at the Department of Justice—and I have got to correct myself. I was saying that his employee, who I can identify now as Tarak Makecha, was responsible for slashing more than \$500 million in public safety, local law enforcement, and victim assistance organizations across the country. Although that was technically correct, more than \$500 million, it really understates the gravity of this offense against public safety. It was \$811 million in grants that were terminated.

Now, understand what a grievous assault this is on our system of government. Congress passes budgets. They are initiated here in the House of Representatives. We voted to appropriate that money to the Department of Justice. The House voted for it. The Senate voted for it. It was signed into law by the President. The money went to the Department of Justice. It was programmed for those purposes. \$811 million was awarded to each of those grantees and now we have got some reportage explaining what happened. It all came down to this one guy, Tarak Makecha, working for Elon Musk.

Did anybody elect him around here? Did anybody confirm him for any job? I don't think so.

He wrote some memos under the authority of dusk, which now I think is an invalidated, discredited authority if you read the opinion from the Federal District Court of Northern California on Friday night because they remember how the Constitution works.

We don't have a fourth branch of government called Elon Musk or Tarak Makecha. This guy wrote memos to the deputy attorney general demanding that all of these grants to law enforcement and public safety and victim assistance groups across the country in our districts be deleted. He wouldn't rest until they were deleted. They were deleted so he said he could report it to his superiors and to the White House.

Now, why aren't we using this valuable time not just to pass a mere reporting bill, which is fine, but how about an action bill?

How about a bill that restores hundreds of millions of dollars to actually promoting criminal law enforcement, public safety, aid to victims of rape and sexual assaults, organizations fighting child sexual abuse across the country? Why don't we do that?

Why don't we just pierce the fog of rhetoric a little bit and get down to something that is actually happening?

Then we can follow that up with what I think would be a significant symbolic statement, as Mrs. MCBATH urges us to do, let's put up the plaque to honor the officers who defended us against the rampage of January 6.

The gentleman from North Carolina, I think, tried to change the subject as if one mob rampage justifies another. I am against all mob violence. I am against all mob rampages. I don't feel like I have to speak out against one of them. If I can't speak out against the one that comes to our House, who will trust me to speak out against mob violence anywhere else? I denounce it wherever it takes place, under whatever guise, under any ideological auspice at all. I denounce mob violence.

I challenge my friend from North Carolina to find me one Democratic official who incited violent insurrection or incited mob violence on that day because I will tell you, this Chamber voted to impeach that President who incited mob violence against us in a sweeping bipartisan vote, Democrats

and Republicans, together. Then the Senate voted 57–43.

The President, in his inimitable way, was able to beat the constitutional odds, but nonetheless, commanding majorities of both Chambers found that he incited violence against us in order to overthrow a Presidential election he had lost by more than 7 million votes.

Find me a Democratic Governor who pardoned any of the mobsters or the violent insurrectionists or people burning down buildings. Can you find me one? Can you find me any Democratic politician who wants to honor those people? Can you?

I can show you a United States President today who seems to think that it was the rioters and insurrectionists who deserve honor and praise.

Don't give me any false analogy or false comparison. We denounce violence everywhere.

Will our colleagues have the courage to ask for the plaque honoring the police officers who opposed the violence that came right into this Chamber? I can hear them chanting: "Hang Mike Pence. Hang Mike Pence."

Remember him? He was the Republican Vice President of the United States, and they chased him out. Now, they would like his memory to go down that Orwellian black hole so nobody remembers him or so nobody remembers the things the Republicans said. They called it terrorism at the time, but now it is inconvenient.

Donald Trump doesn't want police officers being honored for the work they did defending our Constitution, our democracy, our Capitol, and the Members of Congress, including people who sit on that side of the aisle as well as the Members who sit on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVANS of Colorado). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a little over 1 year ago, four law enforcement heroes in North Carolina lost their lives protecting the public from an armed and highly dangerous felon. They showed up to work that morning like it was just another day. They gave the ultimate sacrifice for the Charlotte, North Carolina, community.

However, instead of acknowledging the danger that police officers willingly put themselves in every day and standing behind our men and women in blue, some radical progressives on the left would rather defund the police or even abolish them entirely, but not me and not my colleagues that are here with me today.

This National Police Week, I am honored to stand behind our law enforcement as they keep our communities safe. I am especially proud to stand

today and speak on behalf of H.R. 2240, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act.

As I read this bill, one disturbing fact caught my eye: In 2022, 30 percent of the murders of police officers were unprovoked ambushes. This is unconscionable. As a pastor at First Baptist Church, Charlotte, North Carolina, I actually witnessed and saw families suffering and hurting of police officers that were murdered in just this way.

Police officers are community leaders and public servants who deserve the respect of the country. Instead, it seems coldblooded killers have been deliberately targeting our law enforcement heroes, and it is now more important than ever not to just talk but to act.

I am confident that Congressman MOORE's bill will accomplish just that. Our Nation's police are under constant attack and they need Congress' steadfast support. This bill will shine a light on the threats that law enforcement face, threats that have steeply risen in number ever since the left began its dangerous defund the police rhetoric, and it will begin the process of expanding the resources available to law enforcement officials.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues today to join me in supporting the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act, and let's ensure that our Nation's police forces know that we have their back.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. ELFRETH).

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, local law enforcement officers bravely and tirelessly work to protect our communities day in and day out. The situations that these law enforcement officers encounter put them, as we all know, at an increased risk of developing mental health disorders, including PTSD, depression, and anxiety.

This Police Week, I thank the sponsors of the bill, my colleagues across the aisle, for introducing H.R. 2240, the Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act.

I did offer an amendment to require that the Department of Justice include recommendations on improving training programs for domestic violence cases because far too often our local law enforcement officers are at the front lines of response to domestic violence cases. These situations not only need to be handled carefully with specialized training, but they also take a toll on officers' own well-being.

While this amendment was not made in order, I rise today because I believe it is essential to address the issues of domestic violence and the mental health of our officers in a bipartisan manner.

I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle in addressing this critical need and continuing to address these issues together.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will just spend a little bit more time speaking. Not only are my colleagues apparently letting DOGE get away with terminating the Department of Justice grant programs, but they are also attempting to rob Federal law enforcement officers of their hard-earned retirement benefits.

I will put on the RECORD that, unlike other Federal employees, Federal law enforcement officers are eligible to retire voluntarily after serving our country for at least 20 years and reaching the age of 50 or after 25 years of service at any age.

Now, the Special Retirement Supplement for Federal officers provides roughly one-third of a Federal officer's retirement benefits, bridging the financial gap between when an officer chooses to retire and when they become eligible for Social Security at age 62.

This Special Retirement Supplement ensures financial stability for those who have dedicated their lives and their careers to protecting this country, but our Republican colleagues, their reconciliation bill, would limit the supplement only to those who reach the mandatory retirement age of 57 no matter how many years they have served.

It would also apply not just to new hires but to all officers, to those who clearly earned the ability to claim this benefit and didn't sign up for this new rule. The moment Trump signs the reconciliation bill into law, any officer that retires before reaching the age of 57 would lose one-third of their retirement benefits, making voluntary retirement untenable for every Federal law enforcement officer who is at or near retirement.

□ 1345

Cutting the supplement would have an immediate effect on the retention of overburdened, increasingly demoralized officers across the Federal Government, creating an overwhelming incentive for tens of thousands of eligible officers to retire before they plan to, before this change becomes law.

In closing, it is National Police Week, and we are honoring the brave men and women in law enforcement who put their lives on the line every single day to protect our communities and this Nation.

I was proud to vote "yes" on this resolution on the House floor yesterday to express our Nation's gratitude to our law enforcement. I would also like to thank all the families for their courage and strength because families of law enforcement are part of this, too.

As ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, I hear directly from families and officers from all across the country about the reforms that they desperately need. I will continue to champion bills that provide tools that help our law enforcement officers and keep them all safe because they deserve that.

We stand with all of our officers around the country, whether they be Federal, State, or local, and we thank them for their service.

Though I really wish that we were doing so much more this week to make our officers safe or to invest in resources for their well-being, I will support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the very same. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no shortage of us who are attorneys or at least former attorneys on this floor. One of the things, of course, is when we hear information, we want to run it down and sometimes correct the record.

My good friend from Maryland pointed out about some sort of cuts from DOGE that would affect law enforcement, so I immediately wanted to look and see what he possibly could be talking about. I think what the gentleman was talking about were a couple things.

One was getting rid of a \$250,000 grant, funding for jailed trans inmates working with incarcerated transgender individuals providing gender-affirming care to include housing in gender-appropriate facilities. Actually, I think that is a pretty good thing to get rid of so we can put more resources in to helping law enforcement.

Next is \$2 million for some sort of national listening session for, as I understand it, criminal defendants.

Then we have \$695,000 for a parallel convergent mixed-methods case study. I don't even know what that means, a parallel convergent mixed-methods case study research designed to assess the efficacy of police departments' LGBTQ liaison services.

I think one of the things with this reconciliation bill and with the actions of President Trump is to get rid of the waste and to put the resources to helping our men and women in law enforcement.

During National Police Week, as we are honoring police, while we have a few differences of opinion and may disagree on a few other matters, I am at least comforted by the fact of knowing that we all, on both sides of the aisle, do support law enforcement.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH) has 5½ minutes remaining.



Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman stirred me out of my stupor there by coming back with a couple of grants that apparently were eliminated. I will take his word for it. If I did the internal math correctly, that was less than \$2 million out of \$811 million cut in awards that were made by the Department of Justice to local law enforcement citizen community safety groups, and so on across the country.

Now, apparently there are certain grants that the gentleman doesn't want ever to go out. For example, I take it the gentleman doesn't think very highly of anything having to do with citizens who are transgender. We differ about that, apparently, because I think everybody has civil rights and everybody's voice needs to be heard.

In any event, that needs to be brought up in the Appropriations Committee where we can vote on it democratically. That should not be up to one of Elon Musk's midnight riders, a computer hacker who comes in and simply decides to wipe out all of the handiwork of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate signed into law by the President and then awarded by the Department of Justice.

We do not have a fourth branch of government here, which is what the Federal District Court, Northern California, was saying on Friday.

Are my colleagues aware that there have been more than 250 cases brought against the reign of lawlessness and authoritarianism brought down on America in the first 5 months of the Trump administration? There are 156 preliminary injunctions and temporary restraining orders right now.

A couple of hours ago, the Supreme Court heard the case about Donald Trump in an executive order trying to destroy birthright citizenship in America. Every sixth grader in America knows that if you are born in America, you are a citizen of the United States. They tried to reverse that. That got struck down by four courts.

They call them radical left rogue judges. Well, two of the ones who struck it down were Democratic appointees, one by President Obama and one by President Biden. The other two were Republican appointees, one appointed by President Bush and one appointed by President Reagan, who said that in his four decades on the bench he had never seen a more unconstitutional law than that one. He had never seen an easier case than that one.

You don't have to be a lawyer to understand what is wrong with that. You just have to know how to read. The first sentence of the 14th Amendment says: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States. . . .

These people are finger painting all over the Constitution. They are usurping the rule of law as adopted by the Congress of the United States. They are creating new branches of govern-

ment. I am glad that they finally ran Elon Musk out of town because he was no longer politically useful to him, but in the meantime we have to deal with the wreckage.

If he, by accident, did something the gentleman agrees with, bully for him, great, but in the meantime, he has undone the will of Congress. He has nullified and canceled hundreds of millions of dollars going out to public safety and criminal law enforcement across America.

Let's get back to the rule of law. Let's get back to law enforcement.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said earlier, while I do really support this legislation, I also call on my colleagues to stand with law enforcement by restoring these critical grants commemorating the bravery of our officers on January 6 and every day, protecting their pay, protecting their benefits, and all that the Federal officers have earned over the course of the time that they have served their communities and this country and ensuring that every Federal agency can continue to provide critical assistance to our State and local law enforcement.

We can do a lot better. They deserve so much better from us. Let's please work to do better.

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

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

This is an incredibly commonsense and bipartisan piece of legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. Law enforcement has been demonized and attacked. They have been defunded in leftwing jurisdictions many years ago.

I hope that that movement is forever in the dustbin of our history because we owe it to law enforcement to support them in any number of ways that we can as policymakers. One of the easiest ways, in my mind, is this bill. Data is incredibly important, Mr. Speaker. You know this firsthand. Data is incredibly important. Understanding these attacks on our law enforcement, how it is affected by the officer, how these things occur, where they occur, these data points are incredibly important to understand and protect our law enforcement.

Last year, I think all of the Republicans and the vast majority of my Democratic colleagues supported this very measure. I hope that this year even more Democrats will support it and that it will be signed into law because this data is incredibly important to make sure that we protect our law enforcement officers. This is just a small way that we can advance that initiative forward.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 405, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. 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 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STRONG) at 4 p.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 2255; and,

Passage of H.R. 2240.

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

## FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER SERVICE WEAPON PURCHASE ACT OF 2025

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 2255) to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 182, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—234

Aderholt	Barrett	Bilirakis
Alford	Baumgartner	Bishop
Allen	Bean (FL)	Boehert
Amodei (NV)	Begich	Bost
Arrington	Bell	Brecheen
Babin	Bentz	Bresnahan
Bacon	Bergman	Burchett
Baird	Bice	Burlison
Balderson	Biggs (AZ)	Calvert
Barr	Biggs (SC)	Cammack