

technical staff, it was truly a team effort and it showed. These individuals displayed incredible skill in their respective professions, but also in communication and collaboration with each other.

WTOC's achievement stands as a shining example of professionalism, collaboration, and a deep commitment to fostering a well-informed community.

It is an honor to recognize and congratulate this team today.

□ 1215

WILMINGTON POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUE

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

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of visiting the Wilmington Police Athletic League, a place where community and opportunity are shaping the next generation of Delawareans.

For 23 years, the Wilmington PAL has served as a safe haven for young people in Wilmington and New Castle County, supporting more than 42,000 youth with after-school programming, summer enrichment, and early childhood education.

Their mission, "building brighter futures, engaging with public safety and empowering families" is more than a slogan. It is a daily practice. Through their work, the Wilmington PAL supports children from infancy through high school, ensuring every child they serve has the tools to grow, thrive, and contribute to our State of neighbors. Recently, they expanded their work to support seniors in Delaware.

Organizations like the Wilmington PAL remind us that public safety and public opportunity go hand in hand. I am proud to stand with them, and I will keep working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to expand the resources that make their mission possible.

WAR SURVIVOR REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great honor to recognize War Survivor Remembrance Day.

From 1941 to 1944, Imperial Japanese soldiers occupied Guam and forced our ancestors through hardship and unspeakable violence that has left scars long after the war. In the face of darkness, it was our people's quiet resistance and sense of community that enabled us to survive.

I thank our Greatest Generation for preserving and rebuilding our community on the foundation of family and cultural virtues. Words will never fully

capture the severity or intensity of their experience, but know our gratitude is immense.

As we honor this day, let us not dwell on the horrors of war, but rather celebrate the unwavering spirit and strength of the generation that carried our people through a truly difficult time. May this inspire future generations to do the same in the face of unspeakable hardship.

OUR DESTINIES ARE TIED

(Ms. PRESSLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the traumatic loss of life around the world and to reaffirm a simple truth: Our destinies are tied.

Too often, in moments of crisis, we are bombarded with abstract numbers and detached headlines describing casualties and missiles, but behind every number is a name. Behind every headline is a story: a story of a little girl whispering prayers beneath her blanket hoping the night sky stays quiet or a story of a father digging through rubble, his hands bloodied, desperately searching for his wife and child.

Nations are not just governments and regimes. They are people. They are mothers, sons, teachers, taxi drivers, people whose stories echo our own because they are us. No matter where someone is born or what language they speak, our grief over losing a loved one is the same.

We are bound together by that shared humanity, so we must be relentless in our commitment to peace: peace rooted in diplomacy, peace that is sustained with dialogue, and peace that insists, without exception, that every single life matters.

From Boston to the Middle East, our destinies are tied, and everyone deserves to live free from fear and know peace.

CUTS TO PELL GRANTS

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, House Republicans passed their budget bill, which would make major cuts to the Pell Grant program in order to finance tax breaks for the ultra-wealthy. This will be one of the largest transfers of multigenerational wealth in the history of the country.

Pell grants are awarded to help low-income students afford the cost of higher education so that they can focus on their coursework. Republican changes would force students with disabilities, students with jobs, and primary caregivers to increase their course load or risk losing their Pell grant awards.

Over 5,000 students in the district I represent in northern California receive Pell grants. A study by the Cen-

ter for Economic and Policy Research found that the average income in a community rises by 2½ percent for every 1 percent increase in Pell grants.

We should focus on making education more accessible and doubling the maximum Pell grant, not cutting off support for students who need it the most for people who need support the least.

HAPPY 96TH BIRTHDAY TO RAMON LUIS RIVERA

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

Mr. HERNÁNDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ramon Luis Rivera on his remarkable 96th birthday.

Ramon Luis was the transformative mayor of Bayamon, Puerto Rico, from 1976 to 2000. A member of my opposition party, he won the hearts of voters across party lines as he led his city for nearly three decades.

I offer my congratulations to the mayor.

Mr. Speaker, I will speak in Spanish very briefly, for ease of my constituents.

(Spanish translation of the statement made in English is as follows:)

Hoy, me paro aquí para honrar la vida de Ramón Luis Rivera padre en su cumpleaños número 96. Ramón Luis Rivera fue el alcalde transformador de Bayamón, Puerto Rico, desde 1976 hasta el 2000. Un miembro del partido de oposición al mío, se ganó el corazón de electores y constituyentes más allá de líneas partidistas mientras conducía los destinos de su ciudad por alrededor de tres décadas.

Felicidades, señor alcalde.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Puerto Rico will provide a translation to the Chair.

JEREMY AND ANGEL SEAY AND SERGEANT BRANDON MENDOZA PROTECT OUR COMMUNITIES FROM DUIS ACT OF 2025

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 530, I call up the bill (H.R. 875) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who have been convicted of or who have committed an offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired are inadmissible and deportable, 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 530, 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 is as follows:

H.R. 875

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 "Jeremy and Angel Seay and Sergeant Brandon Mendoza

Protect Our Communities from DUIs Act of 2025”.

SEC. 2. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY RELATED TO DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED OR IMPAIRED.

(a) **INADMISSIBILITY.**—Section 212(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) **DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED OR IMPAIRED.**—Any alien who has been convicted of, who admits having committed, or who admits committing acts which constitute the essential elements of an offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired, as those terms are defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction, offense, or acts constituting the essential elements of the offense occurred (including an offense for driving while under the influence of or impaired by alcohol or drugs), without regard to whether the conviction or offense is classified as a misdemeanor or felony under Federal, State, tribal, or local law, is inadmissible.”.

(b) **DEPORTABILITY.**—Section 237(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) **DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED OR IMPAIRED.**—Any alien who has been convicted of an offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired, as those terms are defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred (including a conviction for driving while under the influence of or impaired by alcohol or drugs), without regard to whether the conviction is classified as a misdemeanor or felony under Federal, State, tribal, or local law, is deportable.”.

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 Alabama (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. 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. 875.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we consider a simple, commonsense bill that says if you are a guest in our country and you drive drunk, you should, in fact, be deported.

To the average American, passing this bill is a no-brainer. Even in a polarized time, Democrats should be able to join Republicans to unanimously support such reasonable legislation. After all, deporting dangerous criminals is a rational, normal, and coherent step that this House should take. Unfortunately, I am skeptical that we will see such agreement from my Democratic colleagues on this bill.

Regardless, I am thankful the House is considering H.R. 875, the Jeremy and

Angel Seay and Sergeant Brandon Mendoza Protect our Communities from DUIs Act, a bill that I introduced last Congress and again this Congress.

Every 45 minutes, that is how often someone in the United States dies in a crash involving an alcohol-impaired driver.

In 2022 alone, there were 13,524 alcohol-impaired driving fatalities. In 2020, drunk driving crashes led to nearly 400,000 injuries.

Those crashes do not discriminate, Mr. Speaker. The victim could be me, it could be you, it could be anyone in our families or in our communities.

This issue hits close to home for me. There was a newlywed couple from my hometown of Enterprise, Alabama, named Angel and Jeremy Seay. I knew this couple personally. I knew their family. I played ball with their dad. Angel and Jeremy were riding a motorcycle together when, out of nowhere, an illegal alien under the influence of alcohol collided into the newlyweds with his pickup. Their lives were cut short by this senseless act.

Tragedies like this are not uncommon across this country. In December of 2023, an illegal alien killed a 46-year-old woman and her 16-year-old son in Broomfield, Colorado, when he drove his truck up to 100 miles an hour and ran into the victims' vehicle, causing it to then crash into a tree. Despite having five previous DUI convictions, a Boulder, Colorado, county judge sentenced this illegal alien to probation, community service, and work release on December 8, 2023, in relation to two of those convictions, just 4 days before the drunk driver crashed and killed the mother and her son.

Another case to consider is from Florida, where just earlier this year an illegal alien from Mexico was arrested for his third DUI after he hit and killed a kindergartner. In Texas, in December of 2024, an illegal alien killed a 7-year-old girl after he drove drunk, crashed into a car that was being driven by the girl's mother.

Just months earlier, under the Biden-Harris administration, ICE had lifted a detainer which had previously been lodged against this illegal alien after he was arrested for assaulting a family member in June of 2024.

H.R. 875 makes commonsense changes to immigration laws to make an alien who is convicted or who admits driving under the influence inadmissible. It also makes an alien convicted of doing so removable. In fact, 59 Democrats voted in favor of this legislation when I brought it to the House floor last February.

If you are a guest in our country and you drive drunk, you should be removed from this country, period.

Drunk drivers are involved in 31 percent of all crash deaths in this country. On average, drunk driving killed roughly 11,000 people in the United States every year between 2012 and 2022. Yet, current immigration law does not make aliens inadmissible or

removable if they drive drunk and recklessly break our laws.

My colleagues across the aisle will undoubtedly argue that this bill is unnecessary because current law already makes DUI inadmissible and a deportable offense. However, if that is the case, then why would they oppose this bill? Even more, their claim that this bill is redundant could not be further from the truth.

Although some aliens who commit DUIs, such as those who kill or injure innocent victims, may be found inadmissible or removable, but the vast majority of the aliens with DUI convictions escape immigration consequences. In fact, on its website just last year, the Biden-Harris administration's U.S. Customs and Border Protection clearly stated: “A single driving under the influence (DUI) conviction is not grounds to deny entry into the United States.”

Moreover, the Board of Immigration Appeals has held that a “simple DUI offense” is not a crime involving moral turpitude that would make an alien removable from the United States. Yet, as we know, any drunk driving event can lead to death, with consequences that are far from what they call simple.

We shouldn't have to wait for repeat drunk drivers to injure someone or kill before they are deported. That is why H.R. 875 is so imperative. It creates safer streets and safer communities for all of us.

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

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

With this strained legislation, we are bumping into two major social problems: deadly drunk driving on our roads and a broken immigration system. Alas, we are not doing anything to solve either problem. The bill pretends to do something about both of them, but it really does little or nothing about either of them.

We lose 11,000 people a year to drunk driving crashes. More than a million people are arrested on DUI charges every year, Mr. Speaker. I lost a beloved cousin of mine in Florida who was in the prime of her life just after graduating from college when she was killed by a drunk driver while she was riding a bicycle on the roads of Florida.

I take this issue of drunk driving very seriously. I have worked on it fastidiously for a long time in my career. There is a lot we could do in Congress to improve safety on the streets, including imposing a nationwide mandatory ignition interlock device on the cars of all convicted drunk drivers. We did that in my State of Maryland after fighting the liquor lobby for a long time, but we finally got that done.

We could also pass my bill, the Sarah Debbink Langenkamp Active Transportation Safety Act, which would support State and local government efforts to build safer transportation networks for bicyclists and for pedestrians.

□ 1230

Unfortunately, this bill does not do anything like that. Indeed, it is hard to see how it will reduce drunk driving at all.

It is obviously not a serious attempt to address the social problem of drunk driving. It does not increase criminal penalties for DUI anywhere in the country. It does nothing to promote public education about the dangers of drunk driving. It will, sadly, improve nothing on the roads.

As an immigration law, it does nothing to make it more difficult for undocumented people to enter our country unlawfully, nor does it make it easier for people to acquire the documents to enter the country legally.

It is a purely punitive measure, and it is both radically underinclusive and radically overbroad.

It only targets the very tiny fraction of all DUI violations in the country committed by noncitizens and does nothing to crack down on drunk driving by citizens, who are responsible for the vast majority of it.

Immigrants who drive drunk are already covered by the criminal law, and the undocumented ones are already categorically deportable. They don't need to drive drunk to be deported. They are deportable now because they are not in the country lawfully.

Additionally, because of the breadth of DUI statutes around the country, this legislation will render deportable people who never drove drunk at all without any opportunity for judicial discretion or waiver. Under current immigration law, undocumented people are already both inadmissible and deportable. Furthermore, conviction for serious DUIs already render even lawful permanent residents who have been in the country for decades potentially deportable and inadmissible in the first instance.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, any noncitizen who is convicted of or who admits to a crime involving moral turpitude, a so-called CIMT, is generally inadmissible to the country. Likewise, any noncitizen who is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude where a sentence of 1 year or longer may be imposed is deportable from the country. Serious DUI offenses are already deportable crimes under current law.

The following DUI offenses are all considered crimes involving moral turpitude: any DUI where the maximum possible penalty is a year or more and where there is serious bodily harm, hit-and-runs, any aggravated DUI, and any DUI involving driving with knowledge of having an invalid, suspended, or revoked license.

This bill goes far beyond even this very stringent current law by making permanent resident green card holders deportable for a single infraction even where no one is hurt and no property is damaged. This will lead to some very harsh results.

In Arizona, sleeping in your car while drunk without even starting the car

can get you convicted of a misdemeanor DUI. Under this bill, a single conviction for even that offense would make a 20-year permanent resident of America, a green card holder, deportable from the country.

That person is rightfully deportable if they engage in an act of drunk driving that hurts someone or kills someone or if they drive drunk without a license, but that is the law today.

An undocumented alien is, of course, deportable in all cases. You don't need a statute to deport them for falling asleep drunk in their car.

Today, there are nearly 13 million green card holders, permanent residents, in the United States. These are people who have followed all the rules. We are not talking about undocumented people, the people who are here unlawfully. They are already taken care of.

There are 13 million green card holders in the United States with 9 million eligible to become citizens now. Categorically deporting individuals who are convicted for any DUI offense without any regard for the severity or consequence simply defies common sense. This legislation on a tiny subset of criminal events distracts from the real problem.

My distinguished colleague has invoked several terrible drunk driving incidents by repeat offenders who are undocumented. They should have been deported from the country long ago. My colleague is talking about people who drive drunk and kill people. That is already a deportable and inadmissible offense. That is not what the meaning of this legislation is.

Let's look at a tiny slice of the criminal events we are talking about and ask whether, in fact, that is something that advances public policy. I don't think it does. Let's work together to impose compulsory ignition interlock devices on the cars of all convicted drunk drivers, including the overwhelming majority who are U.S. citizens. Let's really make the roads safer and stop the repetitive scapegoating of immigrants.

We can address DUIs in a serious way here in Congress if we are serious about the issue. That is what I did as a State senator in Maryland. We could do that across the country, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my good friend.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 875, the Jeremy and Angel Seay and Sergeant Brandon Mendoza Protect Our Communities from DUIs Act of 2025. This piece of legislation is crucial to restoring common sense to our Nation's judicial system.

Over the past 4 years, the Biden administration has allowed millions of

undocumented immigrants to pour into our country. Along with zero oversight and accountability for the crisis, the Biden administration allowed illegal immigrants to stay in the country even after committing horrible crimes.

This piece of legislation would give the courts the ability to deport illegal aliens from America and bar them from reentry if they are convicted of a DUI or a DUI-related charge.

This issue hits home for me. In my district, a 15-year-old girl and her grandmother were killed by an illegal alien who was driving drunk. This was a terrible, avoidable tragedy. Sadly, true justice was not served. The assailant received only 15 years per death and will be out to roam free in America by the time he is 67 years old.

Madam Speaker, this was in Nahunta, Georgia, in Brantley County, in my district. I met with the other grandmother of this child, who shared with me the grief that this family has gone through since that time.

There is no reason at all that this should have happened. There is no reason for the American taxpayer to have to fund the incarceration of this person or any other programs to help him get back on the streets of Georgia.

Though my example is the worst outcome possible, illegal aliens should not be able to stay in America with a minor penalty for driving under the influence in the first place. This legislation would close this loophole.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this forward. It would close that loophole that allows illegal aliens to get off lightly when committing fatal acts, such as vehicular manslaughter under the influence.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation to help bring back common sense to our immigration and legal systems after these 4 years of pure chaos.

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

Madam Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has just offered us a vivid demonstration of what is wrong with this bill and how the rhetoric supporting it doesn't support the bill. He describes an indescribably tragic, terrible case where an undocumented alien is driving a car and kills people in the gentleman's district.

First of all, that person already could be deported just by virtue of being undocumented.

Secondly, under current law, having killed someone, he would be immediately deportable. He was convicted of his offense, sentenced to jail, and he would be deported immediately upon leaving. In fact, the President could commute his sentence, which is what he has been doing, and have him deported right now. You don't need this bill in order to make that happen.

That is a demonstration of why this is superfluous legislation. All it does is to say in a case where, say, nobody is hurt at all, the case of somebody who is asleep in their car in Arizona, for example—there are statutes like that

where you don't even have to be in a moving vehicle. If someone is drunk inside a vehicle, nobody is hurt, and there is no property damage, that person could be deported as a permanent resident even if they have been here for 20 years with kids in school and nothing else on their record.

That is all this bill is doing. It is an opportunity to get up and make speeches about how we are going to get rid of people who kill people in their cars as drunk drivers. That is already the law.

What I am saying is if we are going to take the time on the floor to deal with the problem of drunk driving—and, again, I take this very seriously because I lost a cousin to a drunk driver who is a U.S. citizen, not a noncitizen. The vast majority of drunk driving incidents occur because of citizens, not because of noncitizens, because the vast majority of the people in the country are here legally as citizens.

Let's do a serious thing. Let's say anybody convicted in the country—a U.S. citizen, a permanent resident, or an unlawful person who is somehow still in the country—must have a permanent ignition interlock device put on their car.

Obviously, the undocumented person is going to be deported. Fine. Now, what about everybody else? Should convicted drunk drivers be able to just go back out on the road?

This is the fight I had with Republicans in Annapolis when I was a State senator. They were the ones saying that is too harsh a punishment. I am saying to them, no. Maybe it is painful that you have to go through the ignition interlock device, which says you do the Breathalyzer in your car before you can drive again. They say that it is painful to have to do that every morning and going back from work. That doesn't compare to the pain of someone who loses a mother, a father, a son, a daughter, a cousin, an uncle, an aunt, or what have you.

If we want to deal with drunk driving, let's seriously deal with drunk driving. This legislation is not the way to do it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 875.

I, too, take DUIs extremely seriously. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, approximately 37 people die in drunk driving incidents every day in the United States. As the ranking member has just been noting, there are many things that we can and should do to prevent driving under the influence.

Also, as the ranking member has pointed out, all of these truly horrifying and tragic stories that we are hearing about from the other side are stories that already render an immigrant deportable right now. If you kill somebody right now, you serve your time and then are deported.

We just had a hearing this morning on how the Trump administration is literally dismissing cases for people who are in a legal process for immigration just so they can deport them. They can certainly also do that for somebody who has been convicted of drunk driving and is serving out their sentence. They could take that case and deport that person immediately if they wanted to.

Scapegoating immigrants is what this bill does. It scapegoats immigrants by making a single misdemeanor DUI subject to the extremely serious punishment of deportation. It is simply not an appropriate response.

The bill also applies to all immigrants, including lawful permanent residents, people who Republican colleagues across the aisle have claimed to like, the ones that they said came here the right way. It gives no recognition whatsoever to the patchwork of differences and overbroad statutes of what actually constitutes a DUI across the country in different States.

It is important to recognize first that serious public safety threats are already deportable offenses. We have been talking about this, but it is important to say it again. Again, the cases that are being brought up are cases where those people are already deportable under current immigration law.

Many serious DUI crimes are considered what is called a crime involving moral turpitude and, therefore, already make someone removable or inadmissible. This bill does not recognize how widely DUI laws differ across the country and the extremely low bar that is set to receive a DUI conviction in some States.

For example, in Arizona, the DUI statute allows people to be charged with a DUI if they are intoxicated and have "physical control" of their vehicle. This issue came to a head in the Ninth Circuit, which, in reviewing an appeal of a removal case for a noncitizen who was charged under this law, found that the physical control language meant that under this statute: "One may be convicted under it for sitting in one's own car in one's own driveway with the key in the ignition and a bottle of beer in one's hand."

While the person in this case had been ordered deported because his conviction under Arizona law constituted a crime involving moral turpitude, the Ninth Circuit overturned that ruling because the actions covered by the law could not all reasonably be seen as crimes involving moral turpitude.

As the court put it: "Drunken driving is despicable. Having physical control of a car while drinking is not."

□ 1245

Madam Speaker, if this bill had been law at the time, the case would have never reached the Ninth Circuit because no judge would have had the discretion to rule whether this so-called crime merited deportation. This bill

would prevent judges from being able to decide if the punishment fits the crime.

In my home State of Washington, we have a similar law where someone can be convicted of a misdemeanor DUI without actually driving a vehicle. While Republicans might wave away our concerns by saying that prosecutors have the discretion to not bring charges under these circumstances, we know about this case precisely because prosecutors chose to file charges and it went to court.

This bill does not recognize under these overbroad DUI statutes the individuals who have made a conscious choice not to drive. They have gone to a party. They have had a couple of beers. They realize they should not drive. They go and sit in their car to sleep it off.

Under this bill, those people who have made that conscious choice not to drive impaired may be charged with DUIs simply for sleeping in their car.

I ask my Republican colleagues: How many of them have constituents or friends or neighbors who have sat in their cars after leaving the bar to stay warm? We know how cold Midwest winters get. Should we really criminalize people for staying warm in their cars and sleeping off a hangover? Under this bill, people would now be subjected to deportation.

During markup and at the Committee on Rules, I submitted an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. During markup and at the Committee on Rules, I submitted an amendment to ensure that immigration judges have the discretion to decide if a DUI conviction actually merits deportation for green card holders and others here lawfully.

It would have allowed judges to merely consider mitigating factors, such as if anyone was harmed or the length of time since they were convicted of a DUI. This is a commonsense amendment that would have made the bill substantially fairer. Unfortunately, the amendment was rejected.

There are Members and former Members of this body right here in Congress who have been arrested and convicted of a DUI, and I would just ask that the charity and the grace that we extend for second chances to those people would extend also to those green card holders, including those who have been here for decades. Let's just give a judge the chance to determine whether their conviction merited deportation, let alone that second chance.

Madam Speaker, this bill does nothing but scapegoat immigrants for so-called DUIs, and I urge my colleagues to reject the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, this bill presents a very simple proposition: Should someone who is a guest in this country and who endangers Americans, while driving drunk, be allowed to stay in this country?

Republicans say: Of course, not.

The Democrats say: Sure, why not.

This ought to be a no-brainer, especially after so many incidents of preventable DUI traffic deaths involving foreign nationals.

Then gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) mentioned a few of the cases of aliens with multiple drunk driving offenses released time and time again and not deported, while the butcher's bill steadily grows.

Why are such people allowed to remain in our country? The Democrats want it that way. In 2020, Joe Biden said that illegal aliens with DUI convictions should be allowed to stay in the United States. He said: "You only arrest for the purpose of dealing with a felony that's committed, and I don't count drunk driving as a felony."

When Republicans tried to enact this law in 2021, then Democratic Committee on the Judiciary Chairman JERRY NADLER opposed any limit to DUI convictions. He said that whether someone has 2, 6, 10, or 20 convictions for DUI 30 years ago, someone can change. Of course, that begs the question: How many have to die before they change?

Through some of these debates, the Democrats have consistently supported open borders, sanctuary laws that shield violent criminals, and even modest measures like this one that say we shouldn't have to tolerate guests in this country who recklessly endanger our families.

In fact, now they are telling us that in order to stop their riots, we have to stop enforcing our existing immigration laws.

Madam Speaker, the American people need to take note of debates like this because none more clearly differentiate the two political parties today.

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

Madam Speaker, one can only regard with amazement the high indignation with which the previous gentleman speaker just mobilized against the Democrats in Congress. He accuses us of not taking DUIs seriously, and nothing he said could provide a more striking contrast between the parties.

I am afraid I have to go there. I was hoping not to have to go there. I seem to remember when we met in joint session at what would have been the State of a Union address in this year of 2025.

We left the Chamber after several years of—it seemed like years—several hours of President Trump's speech. We got outside. Then a car plowed into the back of a parked police cruiser. The police descend on this situation. The door opens up. The driver staggers out. It turns out it is the chief of staff to Speaker MIKE JOHNSON.

He is then administered the Breathalyzer test. He got a DWI. He is driving while drunk. Maybe it is a DUI, driving under the influence, in the District of Columbia. Speaker JOHNSON immediately said that everybody deserves a second chance and we should forgive him. We didn't make a big deal out of that.

We have a law right now which allows for the deportation and the inadmissibility of anybody who goes out and drives drunk and injures somebody. If they are here unlawfully, they are kicked out anyway. We are talking about permanent residents to the country. If they go out and get a DUI and injure somebody, they are immediately deported from the country.

They talk about all those cases. Those cases are already covered. We are talking about those cases where somebody is not injured at all and there is no property damage at all. They want to deport those people, even if they have family and even if they have been in the country for 15 or 20 years. They don't even want to give any discretion to the judge to decide.

That is what the disagreement is about. It is about this very small matter in a small number of cases where nobody is injured.

If the distinguished gentleman and his colleagues are really interested in doing something about drunk driving in America, let's use this as the occasion to do it. We have a bill, which is a bipartisan bill, called the End Driving While Intoxicated Act. It has been introduced by Mr. MANN, my colleague from Kansas; my colleague from New Hampshire, Mr. PAPPAS, who is in my party; my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, who is in the Republican Party; and by myself.

We are the lead cosponsors. What it says is if a State is going to get Federal funding for highways and then if somebody is convicted for drunk driving in their State, there must be a compulsory ignition interlock device installed in the car.

What does that mean? For a period of time after someone has been convicted for drunk driving, they have to breathe into a Breathalyzer machine before their car will start. Some of our colleagues say that is too much or that it is too painful for them to go through that. No, it is too painful for us to lose thousands of people on the streets every year to drunk drivers.

If we are serious about the problem and the gentleman invites us to be serious about it, let's be serious about it. Let's do what a majority of the States have done. Let's make this a nationwide program. A compulsory ignition interlock device is saving lives across the country. I think it is in 31 States now and in the District of Columbia.

Why don't we do that? Why don't we do something real, rather than talk about cases that have nothing to do with the bill? Already if a person goes out and kills somebody in their car, they will be deported from the country.

Whether they are a lawful permanent resident or an undocumented person and they could have been deported anyway, that is already taken care of.

I know that those are the lurid episodes that we want to invoke for this legislation, but that is not what this legislation is about.

In any event, it doesn't do anything to reduce drunk driving in America. Let's reduce drunk driving in America. Could we get behind that bipartisan legislation?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Madam Speaker, forgive my emotion. For those of us whose families have experienced it and who have lost people on the roads, drunk driving is a problem of immense magnitude and seriousness. It changes the lives of families all across the country all the time.

I wish our colleagues on the House Committee on the Judiciary would bring out the End Driving While Intoxicated Act legislation to spread the compulsory ignition interlock device around the country. A majority of States and jurisdictions are using it right now. It is working. It should be nationwide.

We can save literally thousands of lives by doing that because it is a very, very small percentage of the population that engages in the profoundly antisocial act of driving drunk. For those who are undocumented, they are already covered, and they are already gone. For those who go out and seriously hurt people or kill people, they are already gone. That is already deportable. That is already inadmissible.

In an effort to try to find another way to go out and demonize and vilify immigrants, this legislation is now picking on people who are permanent residents of the country and could have been here for decades with their families. They get a DUI, which is a terrible thing regardless. They get a DUI, nobody is hurt, and there is no property damage. Then they want to deport those people from the country.

They want to kick those people out of the country. I presume they have got their votes together. They will vote for it. I presume it passes. It doesn't do anything to deal with the problem of drunk driving in America.

The vast majority of drunk driving episodes have nothing to do with a permanent resident who drives drunk and doesn't hurt anybody. That is not where we are losing lives. We are losing lives because there is a small percentage of people who drive drunk repeatedly. The vast majority of them are citizens.

We are not taking that seriously enough, but a lot of States are. In fact, a majority of the States have now imposed the compulsory ignition interlock device on people who have driven drunk and are convicted of it.

That is what we should be working on. That is something that will actually effectuate a change and make a difference. Why can't we do that? That is all I say to my colleague.

I hope they will join us in this legislation. It is bipartisan legislation that comes from the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). I am on it. We have Republicans. We have Democrats. Why don't we do something real to make the roads in America safer?

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

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

Madam Speaker, I would remind our colleagues that 59 Democrats voted for this legislation last February when I brought it. We cannot wait until an illegal driving drunk kills a family member or a member of our community.

Time and time again, Mothers Against Drunk Driving say that on a DUI, normally it is 80 times they have driven drunk before they are actually caught. Statistics show that it is at least a dozen times that people drive drunk before they are caught.

In Florida, that is why we saw the third time an illegal had a DUI was when he killed a kindergartner. The fifth time in Colorado, the judge released him 4 days before an illegal killed a mother and her 16-year-old son.

□ 1300

A friend of mine, a judge who is no longer on the bench, texted me the other night and thanked me for this piece of legislation. He said that in the last administration, he knew in the courtroom when that illegal got the DUI and he turned him over to ICE, they went out, they got in a white van, and they drove off. They did not detain him.

Time and time again, our communities are suffering because we are not taking these people and holding them to account and getting them out of this country.

I encourage my colleagues to get behind this legislation. Americans look to Congress for solutions to real problems. Despite what my colleagues on the other side have argued today, drunk driving by aliens is an issue in this country that must be addressed. This bill does so.

Making guests in our country inadmissible to and removable from the United States, because they have endangered our communities by driving drunk, is just plain common sense.

The Jeremy and Angel Seay and Sergeant Brandon Mendoza Protect Our Communities from DUI Act of 2025 is straightforward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Mr. 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.

SPECIAL INTEREST ALIEN REPORTING ACT OF 2025

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 530, I call up the bill (H.R. 275) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States, 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 530, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. 275

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 "Special Interest Alien Reporting Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. PUBLICATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY OF THE NUM- BER OF SPECIAL INTEREST ALIENS ENCOUNTERED.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than the seventh day of each month beginning with the first full month that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish on a publicly available webpage of the Department of Homeland Security and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the total number, and an identification of the nationalities or countries of last habitual residence, of special interest aliens encountered by the Department during the immediately preceding month. Each such report shall also include the following:

(1) *Such number disaggregated by geographic regions of such encounters.*

(2) *Specifications relating to whether such encounters were made at land, air, or sea ports of entry, between ports of entry, or in the interior of the United States.*

(3) *Identification of any such nationalities or countries of last habitual residence that are covered nations.*

(b) *INCLUSION.*—The first report required under subsection (a) shall also include the mat-

ters described in such subsection for the time period from January 20, 2021, through January 19, 2025.

(c) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *ALIEN.*—The term "alien" has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) *COVERED NATION.*—The term "covered nation" has the meaning given such term in section 4872(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) *SPECIAL INTEREST ALIEN.*—The term "special interest alien" means an alien who, based on an analysis of travel patterns, potentially poses a national security risk to the United States or its interests.

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 Homeland Security or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 275.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 257, the Special Interest Alien Reporting Act of 2025.

This legislation is a critical step toward enhancing transparency and ensuring the Department of Homeland Security provides accurate and timely reporting to the American people regarding encounters with special interest aliens attempting to illegally enter the United States.

As chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I fully support this effort to strengthen oversight and accountability within DHS and safeguard our national security.

Under the Biden-Harris administration's dangerous open-borders policies, droves of special interest aliens, nearly 2 million, and many of them leveraging illicit smuggling networks and irregular migration patterns, flocked to our borders and exploited catch and release policies to access the interior of our country.

The American people deserve to know not just how many entered our country and when, but where they came from.

Fundamentally, this bill simply requires DHS to publicly report on how many special interest aliens were encountered, their countries of origin, and their last country of residence before trying to enter the United States illegally.

The genius of this bill is that DHS can simply add it to the statistics it already reports on a monthly basis. This