

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 331, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

This bipartisan bill will save lives by providing critical tools for law enforcement to combat the ongoing opioid crisis across our country.

Thousands of Americans continue to die each year from fentanyl overdoses, and Ohio has been particularly hard-hit by the epidemic.

Prior to the temporary rescheduling in 2018, fentanyl-related substances could only be controlled individually, allowing cartel chemists to easily create new uncontrolled compounds. This temporary rescheduling proved to be effective as the number of new compounds since then has significantly declined.

The prevalence of fentanyl-related substances and continued trafficking of dangerous narcotics across our southern border requires strong, decisive action from our Congress.

According to the DEA, there were more than 36 million fentanyl pills and nearly 4,000 pounds of fentanyl powder seized in 2025. This represents over 157 million deadly doses.

As a former prosecutor and a co-chair of the Addiction, Treatment, and Recovery Caucus, I understand the importance of law enforcement aggressively targeting traffickers and making sure that we are addressing societal challenges of addiction.

Each life lost to an overdose is a tragedy. We must declare war on the drugs that are killing our kids in our community.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and send it to the President's desk.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 10 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, the bill before us today is the Senate companion to H.R. 27, which we voted on here in the House on February 6 of this year. The two bills are identical, other than a couple of minor punctuation differences. This bill would go to the President's desk, and he said he would sign it.

However, since that vote in February here in the House, the Trump administration has seriously threatened our Nation's ability to confront the ongoing opioid overdose crisis by attempting to dismantle the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA, as I mentioned, firing hundreds of workers, including senior key officials, and rescinding over \$1 billion from State and local behavioral health programs.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to oppose this bill because it is a permanent ex-

tension of fentanyl-related substances as schedule I drugs instead of the temporary one that we agreed on for 2 years in the end of the year 2024 appropriations package.

The temporary option would have left the door open for an off-ramp to substances found to have potential medical applications. This bill would also exacerbate inequities in our criminal justice system because drugs placed on schedule I include mandatory minimum sentencing. Furthermore, S. 331 also does not provide additional resources, as I have mentioned, for prevention, treatment, recovery, or harm reduction.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman said, this is an identical bill to the one that passed out of the House with the exception of a few technical changes the Senate made, including sticking their number on it instead of the House number. Other than that, it is essentially the same bill this House passed and, frankly, with bipartisan support.

I understand the gentleman's objections related to mandatory minimum sentences, but that is a different bill and a different day. That is not what this bill is about. This bill is about making fentanyl analogues a schedule I or making all of them schedule I substances.

The gentleman referenced that there is no off-ramp. I would suggest to him that the off-ramp is in the eye of the beholder.

What we did in this bill, and I think it is something that everybody on the floor can be proud of, we put into this bill the capability to do extensive research by universities, the NIH, and the FDA. We created a framework to do research on the 4,800 believed analogues of fentanyl.

I believe it has two advantages. One, if we find one of these analogues that has no harm and even has a positive effect for some issue, that creates your off-ramp. There is already an off-ramp in the law for drugs that show promise and have a medicinal benefit. That opens up other statutes. This one doesn't have that off-ramp, but other statutes do that would allow if somebody comes in and says, wow, look at what this does. It does good things in the X area or the Y area or whatever. This bill has the component parts to make that possible. Unlike our schedule I on marijuana, which never allowed research or realistic research and created some of the dilemmas that we have today with that substance. We fixed that with this bill.

Secondly, that research component, I believe if there is any benefit in the analogues at all, it may be that one of the analogues—I am not saying it will and I think the odds are slim, but it is possible that one of the analogues will

have a blocking effect on the deadly aspects of fentanyl itself, and that would be a huge positive.

When my colleague says that it has nothing on dealing with the problem as far as people who have an addiction, he is right. It does not today, but that research component has great potential for the future.

In the short run, we stop the Chinese from bringing the precursors to Mexico and the Mexican cartels creating new analogues and trying to get around our laws by claiming it is not really fentanyl, it is an analog. We stop those attempts by the bad guys, the illegal people trying to bring this into our country and bringing it in, unfortunately, successfully. We stop it. We stop them using that technique to get around the law. Then we leave the door open for positive future benefits, if any, in the analogues.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have helped draft this legislation. I am proud to have drafted the part on the research component. I am proud that, notwithstanding the fact that they made a few tweaks and sent back a Senate bill rather than sending back mine and Mr. LATTA's original House bill, I am proud to stand here today in support of the HALT Fentanyl Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues in this House to vote "yes" and let's send it to the President's desk. Let's make this a permanent law in the United States.

As Chairman GUTHRIE said: It is not going to solve every problem, but it makes our kids just a little bit safer.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 489, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H. RES. 476, CONDEMNING THE VIOLENT ANTISEMITIC ATTACK IN BOULDER, COLORADO, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE SURVIVORS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. Res. 476, my bipartisan resolution to condemn the terror attack in Boulder and to denounce anti-Semitism, be called for consideration by the full House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his inquiry.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, my understanding under "Jefferson's Manual," is that the Speaker has the ability to disclose in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the source of the objection. The minority does not object to this unanimous-consent request.

Will the Speaker tell the House and the American public, is it Speaker Johnson that opposes this?

Who opposes unanimous consent to this resolution denouncing the attack?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous-consent request.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL IMMIGRATION COMPLIANCE ACT OF 2025

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 489, I call up the bill (H.R. 2056) to require the District of Columbia to comply with federal immigration laws, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 489, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 119-151, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2056

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 "District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SERVING AS SANCTUARY JURISDICTION.

The District of Columbia may not have in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits or restricts any entity or official of the District government from—

(1) sending, receiving, maintaining, or exchanging with any Federal, State, or local government entity information regarding the citizenship or immigration status (lawful or unlawful) of any individual; or

(2) complying with a request lawfully made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Na-

tional Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer for, or notify about the release of, an individual.

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 Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2056, the District of Columbia Federal Immigration Compliance Act.

The House Oversight Committee has held multiple hearings on the failings of the Biden-Harris administration to secure our borders and protect our citizens. In March, the committee heard from sanctuary city mayors, who offered carefully crafted, lawyerly statements defending their decisions not to work with the Trump administration as it works to remove criminal aliens as quickly as possible.

At the end of the day, illegal alien criminals who threaten our communities have no right to be here in the first place. State and local governments must work with the Department of Homeland Security to share information on individuals they arrest. They must also honor lawful detainers. When they do not, Congress must act.

H.R. 2056 ensures that the District of Columbia cooperates with Federal immigration agencies, including ICE, to protect our citizens and nullifies prior attempts by the District to make itself a sanctuary city.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) for his work on this important topic, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 2056, which would effectively nullify laws, policies, and practices duly enacted by the District of Columbia because I strongly support the ability of the residents of the District of Columbia to govern themselves on local matters.

This is one of two D.C. bills that the House is considering this week to demonize immigrants. Let's be clear: The District of Columbia is in full compli-

ance with Federal law. It does not obstruct ICE from carrying out its duties.

D.C., like many other jurisdictions, limits its cooperation with Federal immigration agencies to what Federal law actually requires. Why do jurisdictions limit such cooperation other than the fact that immigration is a Federal responsibility? Let us ask the police chiefs for an explanation.

The Major Cities Chiefs Association opposes such cooperation for four reasons:

"Enforcement of routine civil immigration by police would undermine the trust and cooperation with immigrant communities which are essential elements of community-oriented policing.

"Courts have held that the lack of legal authority to enforce Federal civil immigration statutes exposes police to liability for unlawful arrest and detention.

"Local agencies do not possess adequate resources to enforce these laws in addition to the added responsibility of homeland security.

"Immigration laws are very complex, and the training required to understand them and to properly prosecute them significantly detracts from the core mission of local police to create safe communities."

Let's be clear again: D.C. is in full compliance with Federal law. It does not obstruct ICE from carrying out its duties, and it is backed by evidence demonstrating that limiting cooperation keeps people safer. Counties with laws that do not honor extrajudicial civil detainers have significantly lower levels of violent crime than counties that don't have such laws.

Mayors, police chiefs, sheriffs, and local leaders across the country have made clear that the way to combat violent crime is allowing local police to do their job of ensuring public safety in their own communities, not commandeering local police to spend limited time and resources rounding up and detaining nonviolent immigrants who pose no threat.

Forcing the District of Columbia to carry out the Federal Government's immigration duties also discourages residents from coming forward to share information with the police about violent crimes for fear that they or someone close to them will be detained or deported. This is simply bad policy and will hurt the residents of the District of Columbia.

The House should reject H.R. 2056 and stop interfering in local D.C. matters. Instead, it should pass the District of Columbia Local Funds Act, and H.R. 51, Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, let's have a candid conversation if we could, sir, with my colleague across the aisle about what is happening here.