

I thank God that our extraordinary military appears to have exquisitely executed its mission. We can be grateful to our military's carrying out of a decision while we ask questions about that decision.

While the news is inundated with reports of Trump's airstrikes, there are many concerns that we are not hearing about here at home: hostages; Ukraine; Federal institutions, like USAID and NIH, gutted; the big, ugly bill that would slash Medicaid for 14 million Americans, including 110,000 of my constituents; and the cruel cuts at SAMHSA that will jeopardize the lives of those struggling with addiction and mental health.

The Trump White House leads with smoke and mirrors, but they are doing incredible harm to my constituents and Americans across this country. I call upon my colleagues to not let them be successful in their attempts to obscure and distract.

Thomas Jefferson said: When injustice becomes law, resistance becomes duty.

Resist.

#### HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BOYD MASON

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

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary American and proud son of south Mississippi, Lieutenant Colonel Boyd Mason, for his nearly three decades of distinguished service to our country.

Lieutenant Colonel Mason served with courage and honor, including 2½ years doing Active Duty in the Vietnam war. His dedication to our Nation didn't end with his military service. He continues to be a guiding light in Jackson County and all across south Mississippi's Fourth Congressional District.

Today, Mr. Mason faces a new battle. The battle this time is a personal one, a fight against cancer.

Yet, his strength and spirit remain unshaken. He is a devoted father of 5, grandfather to 12, and a great-grandfather to 5 more.

Lieutenant Colonel Mason's legacy of service, faith, and perseverance reaches far beyond the battlefield. It lives on in the lives he has touched and the freedoms he helped to defend.

While our military members risk their lives every day for the sake of our great country, it is more important than ever to honor those who answered the call. Lieutenant Colonel Mason is a hero, plain and simple, and I ask all Americans to join me in keeping him and his family in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, we honor Lieutenant Colonel Mason today.

#### RECOGNIZING WILLIAM "BUS DAD" HORNE

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize William Horne, affectionately known as "Bus Dad."

After an impressive 51 years behind the wheel of a schoolbus dedicated to transporting exceptional children within Wilson County Public Schools, Mr. Horne has recently entered a well-deserved retirement.

Mr. Horne was more than just a schoolbus driver. He was devoted to his students and their families. He warmly welcomed each child onto his bus every morning, making sure they were ready for school. His bus was more than just a mode of transportation. It was a safe haven.

Mr. Horne's dedication exemplifies a great American story highlighting the essence of public service: impactful, consistent, and full of love and compassion.

I thank Mr. Horne for his extraordinary commitment to his students over the decades. His legacy will remain with those he has touched, and I wish him a wonderful retirement.

#### WAKE-UP CALL FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again stress the need for immigration reform in this country.

Just last week, back home, one of my taxpaying constituents, Narciso Barranco, was picked up by who I believe were ICE agents—they were masked—and is now sitting in an ICE holding facility in Los Angeles. Videos show him being punched by masked Federal agents, unprovoked.

Narciso Barranco has lived in my district for 25 years or more and doesn't have a traffic ticket to his name. More importantly, he has three sons—three sons—all serving in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, we make movies about families like this. He has three sons who are ready to make the ultimate sacrifice for this great Nation, and, instead, he is being held in custody in an ICE facility in Los Angeles.

Our Federal agents should be taking criminals off of our streets, not gentlemen like this.

I pray that Mr. Barranco's case is a wake-up call for all of us for immigration reform.

#### CALLING ON TRUMP ADMINISTRATION TO RESTORE LIFESAVING FOOD AID

(Mr. MAGAZINER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the 26th time to call on the Trump administration to honor its word and restore funding for lifesaving food aid around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the words from the Trump administration have been pretty good on this. Elon Musk said that funding for emergency food aid will be restored. Marco Rubio has repeatedly said he was going to do it. They even got FOX News to write a glowing online article about their plans to restore funding.

Yet, it has been 6 months since they cut this funding off. It has been 6 months, and every day that they wait is another day that children die of starvation unnecessarily.

Every day, there are children whose organs are shutting down, who are unable to eat conventional food, and who can only have their lives saved by ready-to-use therapeutic food manufactured in the United States.

Every day, the clock is ticking. The administration needs to do what it said it is going to do: restore funding for this aid. I will continue to stand on this floor every day until they do.

#### CONDEMNING THE VIOLENT JUNE 2025 RIOTS IN LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 530, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 516) condemning the violent June 2025 riots in Los Angeles, California, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 516

Whereas, on June 6, 2025, protests began in response to lawful Federal immigration enforcement actions by the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas these protests quickly escalated into violent riots across Los Angeles, where acts of arson, widespread looting, property destruction, and vandalism were committed, blocking streets and highways, lighting streets on fire, throwing rocks at law enforcement vehicles, and assaulting Federal and local peace officers;

Whereas rioters have shot commercial grade fireworks and thrown Molotov cocktails at Los Angeles Police Department officers and assaulted Federal agents;

Whereas rioters burned American flags, an act that disrespects the nation that protects their freedom;

Whereas California Governor Gavin Newsom asserted that "local law enforcement didn't need any help," despite the Los Angeles Police Department declaring that the violence had worsened and spiraled out of control;

Whereas more than 561 rioters have been arrested, and 12 brave officers with the Los Angeles Police Department have been injured in efforts to contain the chaos;

Whereas local and State leadership failed to contain the rapidly escalating disorder, failing to support overwhelmed law enforcement personnel;

Whereas the actions of law enforcement have been crucial in preventing further violence and protecting law-abiding citizens from harm;

Whereas the U.S. Small Business Administration called on California Governor Gavin Newsom to request an SBA Economic Injury Disaster Loan Declaration to authorize SBA to deliver urgent assistance to Los Angeles-based small businesses that have been looted by rioters;

Whereas the Los Angeles Ambulatory Care Center, which provides health services for veterans, was closed for several days due to civil unrest, resulting in the cancellation of over 700 in-person appointments for United States veterans;

Whereas the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Los Angeles field office was temporarily closed due to the violence caused by anti-ICE riots and protests;

Whereas some mainstream media outlets and Members of Congress have falsely labeled the protests as "peaceful" and with "no violence" happening in Los Angeles;

Whereas United States Immigration and Enforcement officers have faced a 413% increase in assaults against them, and their family members have been doxed and targeted;

Whereas United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers have arrested at least 330 illegal aliens with prior criminal convictions such as murder, drug trafficking, assault, cruelty to children, domestic violence, robbery, and human smuggling;

Whereas illegal aliens have perpetrated violence against law enforcement officers; and

Whereas California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over United States citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the right to assemble and protest peacefully;

(2) condemns unequivocally the violence perpetrated against Federal, State, and local law enforcement; and

(3) calls on local and State elected leadership to work with the Federal Government to end the violent riots and restore peace; and

(4) expresses gratitude to law enforcement officers, including the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol, Orange County Sheriff's Department, and other local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies, including the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for keeping our communities safe in the face of danger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution 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 California (Mr. KILEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILEY of California. 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. Res. 516.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a couple weeks ago, the entire world witnessed horrifying scenes out of Los Angeles: Molotov cocktails and bricks being thrown at officers, Waymo cars being lit on fire, American flags being burned, and roadways being blocked.

Today, we will stand as a House to condemn these acts of violence and to condemn the irresponsible politicians who refused to adequately address them.

I think it is important to understand from the beginning the events leading to these horrific scenes.

We should first recognize that ICE was undertaking operations in Los Angeles that have been very standard across administrations, Democrat or Republican.

President Obama, after all, carried out millions of deportations, and the priority has always been to focus on those who have a criminal record and who pose a risk to the public. That is precisely what ICE was doing in Los Angeles. Among those targeted were murderers, pedophiles, and drug traffickers.

It should also be recognized that one of the reasons that some of these people had to be sought out in the community is that the city of Los Angeles and the State of California have chosen to enact sanctuary policies that explicitly forbid ICE from taking custody of these dangerous individuals in the safest and least disruptive setting, in a custodial setting, that is, in jails. That is the explicit purpose of our sanctuary laws.

Despite these facts, as these operations were being carried out in a standard and targeted way in Los Angeles, you had certain politicians who engaged in inflammatory rhetoric, who then had individuals gather to disrupt the activities of ICE and our Federal officers, and then you saw these extreme and horrifying acts of violence.

I will be very clear: I will defend in any way that I can the right to assemble and protest regardless of the content of what the protesters are advocating. This is foundational. It is fundamental to the American system of government, but violence is another matter entirely.

This is not just a matter of protests crossing a line. Violence is the antithesis of protests. It seeks to shut down the process of deliberation, argument, and debate. It seeks to exalt force over reason. It is an abandonment of the American experiment of self-government.

By the way, this is especially true when the very purpose of the violence

is to impede the policies of a duly elected President from being carried out. It is to say that a violent agitator should be able to overthrow through force the will of a democratic majority that has been established through a democratic, free, and fair election.

That is what we bore witness to in Los Angeles. Yet, instead of doing everything possible to restore order, to protect the citizens of Los Angeles, to protect our law enforcement officers, and our Federal officers, you saw certain irresponsible vainglorious politicians in California decide that this was their star-making moment, where they would egg on the violent agitators, where they would try to pick a fight in every way they could with the President, even going so far as to file a frivolous lawsuit that was thrown out unanimously by the Ninth Circuit.

Worst of all, these politicians decided to place the blame for the violence on our incredible National Guard members, somehow saying it was their presence there that caused it. This is deeply offensive, and our National Guard members are owed an apology.

Today, I hope we can stand together, Republicans and Democrats, in making it very clear that protests and assembly are fundamental rights in this country and that acts of violence are a grave threat to those rights.

Specifically, this resolution recognizes the right to assemble and protest peacefully, condemns unequivocally the violence perpetrated against Federal, State, and local law enforcement, calls on local and State-elected leadership to work with the Federal Government to end the violent riots and restore peace, and expresses gratitude to law enforcement officers, including the Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, California Highway Patrol, Orange County Sheriff's Department, and other local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies, including the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for keeping our communities safe in the face of danger.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the California Democratic Delegation who leads the 45 Democrats in the California delegation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Kim resolution.

Now, had it just condemned violence and thanked the National Guard and the Marines, who did not ask for this assignment, I think we would all be on board.

Instead, the resolution really is engaging in partisan games with misleading and inflammatory provisions.

Trump said he was going to go arrest and deport violent criminals. People are okay with that. Instead, armed, masked ICE agents, some refusing to identify themselves, aggressively, and

in some cases even violently, took down day workers at Home Depot, busboys, gardeners, and a union leader, and regular people in Los Angeles objected to that. Then, as the First Amendment provides, they peacefully protested against it.

Unfortunately, there were some hooligans and rowdies who infiltrated that group, and they committed violent acts and vandalism. For that, they should be prosecuted. They should be brought to justice and condemned, which we do.

However, the resolution really creates a misleading picture of what happened. On the first page, it says: "Whereas these protests quickly escalated into violent riots across Los Angeles, where acts of arson, widespread looting, property destruction . . . lighting streets on fire. . . ." The fact is that these demonstrations were largely confined to about a 10-block area in downtown Los Angeles.

The police, LAPD, had the situation under control. There is an elaborate system of mutual aid in California, and had they needed additional forces, it was readily available under mutual aid.

I will point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in case they need a reminder, L.A. County is 4,060 square miles, not the 10 blocks. When President Trump deployed the Marines and National Guard in L.A., it was not at the request of local officials, the chief of police, or the Governor. It was unprecedented, unnecessary, and a clear attempt to take over the State's law enforcement authority. In fact, I think it did aggravate tensions in the area.

Now, the National Guard remains in Los Angeles to this day. They have nothing to do. We heard a report from a former commander that less than 20 percent are doing anything and they have been taken away from jobs where they were needed; for example, helping in efforts of forest fire prevention and the like.

As the elected chair of the California Democrat delegation, I was proud to join my colleague (Ms. BARRAGÁN) in introducing a resolution that, unlike this one, is based in fact.

Our resolution condemns the President's authoritarian response to First Amendment expressions of dissent, unlike the Kim resolution. It expresses support for law enforcement and for the National Guard and for the Marines, and it condemns violence by those who committed it.

Now, why is this important? In the resolution, it is so partisan. It says: "Whereas California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over United States citizens."

That is absurd. That is insulting to our elected officials, but it is right in keeping with what the President has said. He has indicated publicly that he intends to target cities and States that are democratically elected, that have Democrats elected in government.

What a strange thing to say.

The executive order that nationalized the California National Guard applies to anywhere in the United States. It is not just L.A. It is not just California.

I think this resolution really, as false as it is, is serving as a predicate, as a foundation for the military to be used in places all over the United States on any pretext, so that the military can go in and assume civilian authority away from those who are democratically elected.

That is why it is important that we do not approve this resolution with its false whereases, and that we do not participate in a scheme to replace the democratically elected officials in cities and counties and States across the United States.

I will just end with this: Who should we be more concerned about? What should we be more afraid of: the gardeners that are being arrested by ICE, the busboys, the farmworkers, or the concept that the administration may be taking the steps to replace, with the military, civil authority that has been duly elected around the United States?

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let's make sure that we are dealing with the facts as they actually occurred. The assertion the LAPD had the situation under control; we all saw otherwise on our television sets. The LAPD chief himself said that every person in Los Angeles should be disgusted by what occurred.

The Governor has, himself, in the past, recognized the virtue of using the National Guard when you had situations that required reinforcement.

This notion that somehow the President was taking over the State's law enforcement authority, the Ninth Circuit said otherwise unanimously. Even a Biden-appointed judge said: The President was exercising his authority to prevent the disruption of the enforcement of Federal law.

As to this notion that the violence was largely confined to downtown L.A., I can't agree with the assertion that it is somehow less objectionable to have violence occur within a concentrated area than on a more diffused basis.

Finally, this disparagement of our ICE officers for wearing masks. I think that this is outrageous. We have seen threats against our ICE officers absolutely skyrocket. It is very ironic for folks that had no problem forcing 2 year olds to wear masks all day, in defiance of even the World Health Organization's guidelines, that are now somehow objecting to Federal officers who feel the need to do this in order to protect themselves and their family.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KILEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 516 to condemn the violent riots in Los Angeles this month, and I thank our brave law enforcement officers for keeping us safe.

I appreciate the heated debate and the conversation. I thank my colleague (Mr. KILEY) for leading on the groundwork and for explaining what led to the events that occurred last month in Los Angeles, which explains that Federal agents were conducting immigration enforcement, according to the law.

Mr. Speaker, protecting public safety should not be controversial. This resolution is very simple. It recognizes a right to assemble and protest peacefully, and it condemns unequivocally the violence perpetrated against Federal, State, and local law enforcement. It calls on local and State-elected leadership to work with the Federal Government and restore peace. It also expresses gratitude to our local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers for bravely keeping our communities safe in the face of danger.

□ 0930

That is what this is about. Do you stand with our law enforcement officers working to keep our communities safe and have the common sense to call out rioters who commit vandalism, violence, property damage, and other crimes in our streets?

Mr. Speaker, like others in the Chamber and many across this country, I am an immigrant who came here legally in pursuit of the opportunities that this country provides. I am proud to be an American, and I am paying it forward to keep the American Dream alive for my children and grandchildren.

Peaceful protests are a constitutional right we all cherish, and our communities should not be living in fear. But peaceful protests and freedom of assembly gave way to chaos in Los Angeles, as we witnessed a few weeks ago.

We saw acts of arson, looting, property destruction, vandalism, blocking streets and highways, lighting cars on fire, shooting fireworks, throwing rocks at law enforcement vehicles, and even assaulting Federal and local police officers. As a result, we saw more than 500 rioters were arrested, and at least a dozen LAPD officers were injured.

Local and State leadership clearly could not contain the chaos. The riots have cost at least \$30 million to pay overtime and repair property damages to city buildings. This doesn't include the small businesses and other private entities whose businesses fell victim to the destruction.

We also know that the riots were enabled by California's soft-on-crime policies that have allowed for lawlessness and endangered public safety.

Again, this resolution recognizes the right to assemble and protest peacefully, condemns the violence against law enforcement, and calls on local and State officials to work with the Federal Government to restore peace. We thank our law enforcement. This is not controversial.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask, what happened? My hometown, Santa Ana, California, is predominantly Hispanic Latino. Factory workers live there. Remember, we are the biggest manufacturing State in the Union. Nearshoring, guess where it is happening?

California is the largest ag State in the Union. There are a lot of farmworkers in my district. What happened? One day, we are going about our business in Santa Ana, Orange County, masked Federal agents start going into our neighborhoods, picking up hard-working neighbors. Oh, yeah, you bet, people were concerned, scared, and nervous.

A lot of people expressed their First Amendment rights. We got the National Guard. Orange County Sheriff Don Barnes did not call for the National Guard. Local police chiefs did not call for the National Guard. We get the National Guard.

President Trump promised to deport criminals, those with deportation orders, those here less than 2 years, but now it is hard workers, people who pay taxes that are being picked up. Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of those being picked up are now people without criminal records.

Orange County didn't have any violence. We had masked officers coming into our neighborhoods.

I bet President Trump would want to know what is going on on Main Street. One of the constituents that just got picked up I talked about a minute ago, Narciso Barranco. He has been in the U.S. for 25 years. He is a gardener and a father of three marines. We make movies of people like this. This gentleman is a hero. His family are heroes. Instead, he is in an ICE holding facility in Los Angeles.

I am hearing more stories coming, more Barranco-type families being broken up, military families being separated from their loved ones by ICE. I do not believe President Trump would want his legacy to be that he deported military family members like Mr. Barranco.

Let's use common sense here. This resolution is not prime time for a vote. There are a lot of inaccuracies. I am going to ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am moved by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from California, and I wonder what our colleagues think the value is other than of a purely political nature to a resolution that purports to be honoring law enforcement when it is set up on a completely partisan basis. I wonder what the value of that is.

I especially wonder what the value of that is when the majority doesn't even stand by actual law when it comes to honoring law enforcement because this body on March 15, 2022, passed a resolution to put up a plaque, a simple plaque to honor the noble and brave police of-

ficers who battled for 4 or 5 hours to stop a violent riot and insurrection unleashed against this Chamber and against the Senate in an attempt to overthrow a Presidential election.

We voted to erect a plaque in their honor. That was on March 15, 2022. It was supposed to have been put up on March 15, 2023. We are now more than 2 years overdue in honoring those police officers, 140 of whom were wounded, injured, disfigured, and many of them permanently disabled. Several lost their lives in the days to follow that atrocity, attack on this body.

There is a law which says put up the plaque, and Speaker JOHNSON and the majority will not put the plaque up which is why you walk in the House Office Buildings now, everywhere there are poster replicas of that plaque being put up.

Now they want to pass a resolution deploring violence that took place thousands of miles away from here, and it is just a resolution, a hortatory resolution. They can't even get bipartisan support because of course they have to set it up on a polemical, partisan basis instead.

What is the utility of that resolution when they won't even follow an actual law to honor police officers who put themselves between us and a blood-thirsty mob?

That is not a partisan point because the Republicans denounced it at that time as terrorism, as an attack on this institution, as intolerable, as unacceptable.

I am happy to share with my colleague, who I know wasn't in Congress at the time, all of the statements made by Republican leaders at that time begging Donald Trump to send in the National Guard, which he controlled because it is the District of Columbia National Guard, and he didn't do it. He sat and watched it, eating hamburgers or whatever, in the White House on TV, ignoring all of the appeals to send the National Guard to come and defend Republican and Democratic Members of Congress.

Now we have got a law which says put the plaque up in honor of these officers, and they can't do it, but they want to bring a totally partisan resolution to the floor deploring violence thousands of miles away, and you have got Members of Congress from California saying that they are not capturing what actually happened there.

However, no, it has got to be another opportunity for partisan division. Why? Why can't we honor law enforcement together and follow through on our word?

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As to the comments of my colleague from California, he set forth his view as to what the priority and the limitations ought to be when it comes to deportation policy. He is, of course, act-

ing appropriately in doing so. That is his right, and that is his prerogative as a Member of Congress, as it is for any citizen.

This resolution does not have anything to do with the merits of his view. This resolution simply states that one should not use violence in order to advance that view. I would hope that this should be a principle we should be able to agree on on a bipartisan basis.

As to my colleague from Maryland's claim that this resolution is somehow set up in a partisan way, nothing could be further from the truth. The resolution simply condemns acts of violence. We are opposed to sanctuary policies. We are opposed to putting a target on the back of our Federal officers, and, frankly, to defunding the police.

It is not our fault that those who have allowed this violence, who have promoted sanctuary policies, who have put a target on the back of our officers, and who have called for defunding the police all happen to belong to one party.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, many Democrats in this House have called the L.A. riots peaceful, even while Americans watched with their own eyes as marauding mobs under foreign flags set cars on fire, threw concrete blocks at police, terrorized motorists, and vandalized and looted local shops.

The Democratic vice mayor of Cudahy has called on criminal street gangs to attack Federal law enforcement.

The Democratic mayor of Los Angeles said that for the riots to stop, the Federal Government had to stop enforcing Federal immigration law. You just heard the same sentiment expressed on this floor a few minutes ago.

The Democratic Newsom administration has paid millions of taxpayer dollars to one of the principal organizers of these riots.

I have news for the Democrats: The doctrine of nullification died with the Confederacy. States are not permitted to obstruct the enforcement of Federal law. In a humiliating slap-down of Mr. Newsom, even the notoriously liberal Ninth Circuit Court ruled that the President has the clear authority to federalize the National Guard to restore order whenever State or local officials are derelict in their duty to protect the public and enforce the law.

Remember how all this started: ICE agents attempted to execute court-ordered warrants on criminal illegal aliens. When a mob intervened, ICE called for local law enforcement. The mayor reportedly stopped them from responding, and the Governor did nothing. Now, we saw during the George Floyd riots what happens when leftist officials refuse to counter violent mobs: American cities aflame, billions of dollars of damage, and 19 people killed.

This resolution condemns the violence, but there is something far more sinister afoot that strikes at the very foundation of a constitutional Republic: the rule of law. As Abraham Lincoln told the Democrats long ago: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law," and this generation of Americans is taking note.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear my colleague invoke Abraham Lincoln in the rejection of disunion secession and violent attack on the Federal Government.

Neither of my colleagues who is on the floor has said a word explaining why they won't put the plaque up to honor hundreds and hundreds of police officers on the Capitol Police force, the Metropolitan Police Department, and the Montgomery County Police throughout the region who came to defend us. Why won't they put the plaque up if they are really such big supporters of the police? That is a law.

They just want to pass a resolution. Their resolution, of course, is completely political. One of their whereas clauses is: "Whereas, California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over U.S. citizens."

That is just defamation of the law enforcement officials in California. It is defamation against the Governor of California, the mayor of Los Angeles, the sheriff in Los Angeles County, the chief of police in L.A., all of whom fought to put that violence down when riots broke out, something Donald Trump never did when the riots broke out that he incited against us.

Remember, he was impeached by this body for inciting a violent insurrection against us. Not only did he not do anything to defend us, but he was the one who caused the whole chain of events that led to the deaths that took place that day and the violence that took place that day. My colleague won't utter a word about it. He won't say a word about it.

All of the attempt to focus everybody over there is a distraction from the fact that they still, to this day, are defending what Donald Trump did with January 6. Why? It is because they also defend his lie that he won the 2020 Presidential election, which he lost by more than 7 million votes, 306 to 232 in the electoral college.

□ 0945

I don't know what the meaning of their totally partisan resolution is when they won't even stand by the law—it was signed into law by the President—to put up a plaque, a simple plaque honoring police officers who fought tooth and nail for hours against the most bloody, vicious, violent insurrectionist mob ever to attack the Capitol of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this extremely partisan resolution that seeks to legitimize President Trump's baseless attacks on Los Angeles and our elected leaders, including Governor Newsom and Mayor Bass.

This administration's mass ICE raids by masked agents who will not identify themselves have trampled on our rights and left our community shaken but not defeated.

The President manufactured a crisis in Los Angeles and then blamed our constituents for it. He induced ICE to terrorize our community, detaining hundreds of hardworking residents at places like Home Depot and car washes, including U.S. citizens like Job Garcia, a doctoral student in my district at Claremont Graduate University. He was manhandled, thrown to the ground, and handcuffed.

For this, the President called in the National Guard and Marines?

This resolution only gives credence to Trump's dangerous rhetoric. Instead, we should be considering the resolution introduced by California's Democratic delegation, which condemns anyone engaged in violation of the law, violence, or vandalism. Most importantly, it stands up for our constitutional rights to due process and free expression and shows our appreciation to local law enforcement for upholding public safety.

Rather than feed into the President's cruelty, we are standing up for the communities we were elected to represent.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her excellent point. The California delegation has advanced, with Ms. LOFGREN, a truly bipartisan resolution that deplores all violence because the political violence is getting out of control in America.

We just had colleagues in Minnesota who were the subject of assassination attempts, and, of course, the former speaker of the Minnesota House was killed, along with her husband, and a State senator was wounded, along with his wife.

We deplore all the political violence across the board, and we defend the right to speak. We look for policies from the Federal Government that will not exacerbate conflict but will reduce conflict.

This resolution is far from being non-partisan, as my distinguished colleague argues. In fact, it attacks the Governor of California, Members of Congress, California leadership, and the mainstream media. I mean, come on.

We know the difference between what is a partisan, gotcha resolution and a resolution that actually attempts to unify people around common values.

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this notion that the President manufactured a crisis is simply asking us not to believe our eyes. You actually had Members of Congress from California who said that there was no violence, even though we all saw on television cars being lit on fire, Molotov cocktails, and bricks being thrown at officers. Among many other acts of violence, we had several officers who were injured during the process.

What did the President do? He asked our dedicated National Guard members to come in to protect Federal property and Federal officers.

To say that this somehow was what caused the crisis is not only completely at odds with the facts as we all witnessed them but is incredibly offensive to our dedicated National Guard members who went there and have successfully managed to keep the peace.

As to my colleague from Maryland who has now accused us of defamation with this cause, whereas California's leadership has prioritized protecting illegal immigrants and violent individuals over United States citizens, that is simply the very purpose of a sanctuary law, be it California's sanctuary State law or Los Angeles' sanctuary city law.

The entire purpose of these laws, their explicit effect, is to provide special protection for those who have not only come into the country illegally but have committed crimes.

I will give you an example of how sanctuary policies work in practice. We had a case not far from Sacramento where there was an individual who was in police custody for assaulting a peace officer. He had been arrested and was in custody. This is during the Biden administration, by the way.

ICE saw that he was in custody and asked to take custody of him from the sheriff's office so that he could be deported. The sheriff's office had to say, no, sorry, we are not allowed to do that under the sanctuary State law.

The next week, that man murdered his own three daughters as well as their chaperone, a horrific crime that never would have happened if not for California's sanctuary policies.

In a similar vein, many of the operations which ICE conducted in a targeted and standard way in L.A. would have been unnecessary if it were not for a sanctuary policy that forbade them from taking custody of these individuals within a custodial setting.

I would simply ask my colleague from Maryland: Are we to take it from his remarks that he would support reversing the sanctuary policies that have caused so much harm in California and Los Angeles?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California talks about defunding the police. He might want to update his talking points because look who is defunding the police. President Trump and the

Republicans are defunding the police, and we know that because we debated it for hours on this floor.

His DOGE agents, back when Elon Musk was still in town before he got run out of town by somebody, DOGE said a guy in the Department of Justice cut out an estimated \$500 million in community project funding to police departments across America, victim rights organizations, and others receiving those grants. They have not been able to explain it. They didn't even know it was happening.

Of course, they unleashed DOGE on the Department of Justice and hundreds of millions of dollars in State and local law enforcement, victim assistance, rape survivor organization grants, all of that was cut by them. Of course, they are also cutting more than a billion dollars in law enforcement funding in the DOJ appropriation this year.

We don't need any lectures about defunding the police from people who are actively defunding the police and people who are refusing to follow the law in honoring the police. My friend from California refuses to utter a word about that.

Could somebody please explain why they are not following the law and putting a plaque up to honor the officers who came to save our lives on January 6?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in fierce opposition to this performative and misleading resolution that reads like a cheap script treatment looking for a second-rate director.

H. Res. 516 is not about public safety. It is about fear, scapegoating immigrants, and gaslighting the American people into believing that Los Angeles is some so-called hellscape. If it is such a hellscape, I want to know why Republican Members of Congress have been flying into Los Angeles over the past few weeks attending fundraisers. Nobody is showing up in a hazmat suit or combat gear.

If it is such a hellscape, pull back the cameras and release the drone footage so we can see what is happening across the entire city.

This resolution ignores the fact that the violence didn't start in a vacuum. It was sparked by the Trump administration's provocative, aggressive immigration raids across the State.

ICE agents were in neighborhoods, grocery stores, and churches. I have never seen a segment on TV about an MS-13 cartel boss in the third grade. That is what we are seeing.

Of course, we came out and protested. That is what democracy looks like. Of course, our communities are terrified across Los Angeles, across the State, and across the country.

Instead of listening to us, the people from L.A., the President escalated this

drama, deploying the National Guard and the Marines to Los Angeles without a request from local law enforcement, the Governor, or the mayor.

Why? To launch a pathetic, made-for-TV reality TV show to justify authoritarian crackdowns and to divert from the real violence, the violence of cutting \$880 billion from Medicaid, the violence of kicking people off of healthcare, and the violence of tanking our economy into the gold toilet.

That is what we should be talking about. That is what this President doesn't want us to talk about, so he turned the cameras and the manufactured, fabricated violence onto Los Angeles.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, this audacity in blaming local leaders is about optics, power, control, and stoking the ego of Republicans and king daddy.

We are tanking the California economy, the fourth-largest economy in the world and the largest donor State. I refuse to support this resolution.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an odd notion that we have heard repeatedly, that the violence was only concentrated in part of L.A. and that we need to zoom out and look at the city as a whole.

For the folks who had to deal with this chaos in downtown L.A., it is little comfort to them that things might have been more serene in Beverly Hills.

My colleague from California uses the term "hellscape" for L.A. I am not sure I would use that term.

I can say that L.A. has had a lot of problems, so much so that the sheriff's department even had to come out and tell folks not to wear their jewelry when they go outside, to just put it on after they get to their destination.

As to the assertion that somehow this is a made-for-TV spectacle created by the President, I ask what made for more sensational TV images, the Waymos being set on fire and the Molotov cocktails being thrown at officers, which is to say that the things that happened before the National Guard got there, or our dedicated National Guard members standing outside Federal buildings, making sure that no further damage to property and life occurred?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has engaged in a spirited defense of the immigration policies of the administration. I wonder if he would clarify for us what the policy is this week, or at least today, with respect to agriculture in California or any other State.

President Trump heard from the Secretary of Agriculture and large agrarian interests saying that his immigration policies were destroying agriculture in America by getting rid of tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of people who work there and that they are disrupting the entire agricultural economy.

Then, Donald Trump announced that there were some very fine, good workers within the agriculture sector, and they would not be enforcing the law there. That lasted for several days, and then there was a reversal. They went back to saying, yes, we will be doing ICE immigration crackdowns again.

Then, Donald Trump heard again from the Agriculture Secretary, as I understand it, and other interests, and he said no, they would be leaving some of these people alone.

I wonder if the gentleman could clarify that for us, and I wonder whether it causes him to second-guess in any way his absolute support for these policies. Maybe it suggests that there is something wrong with what they are doing and that the administration could go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this partisan and misleading resolution under consideration.

We have heard our colleague distort the facts already through this debate. I want to remind the American people and everybody that it was local law enforcement that got the situation under control before the National Guard and the Marines showed up. I know because I was on the phone with the sheriffs and local law enforcement who said, no, they don't need anybody, that the situation was under control.

This resolution distorts the facts of what happened in Los Angeles. It falsely paints a picture of widespread chaos across Los Angeles to justify and legitimize Donald Trump's dangerous decision to deploy the National Guard and U.S. Marines on American soil, all without the consent of California's Governor or a request from local leaders and law enforcement.

That is why I worked with Representative ZOE LÖFGREN to introduce a resolution that condemns violence, supports peaceful protests, and sets the facts straight.

Angelenos have exercised their First Amendment right to peacefully protest Federal ICE raids that have terrorized our communities. Unfortunately, there have been a small handful of troublemakers who have taken to the streets to cause destruction and physical confrontation.

□ 1000

Mr. Speaker, they should be arrested and prosecuted, something that the Governor, the mayor, and L.A.'s congressional delegation have called for from the start.

Let's remember, though, how we got here. What we have seen on our streets



is chilling. There are masked men in unmarked cars. They have no identification or badge. They are drawing weapons. They are swarming businesses and parks to indiscriminately stop, arrest, or detain immigrants and U.S. citizens.

People are being stopped and detained because of the color of their skin. These are not violent criminals. The majority of the people have no criminal record.

They are taking the parents, and they are leaving the kids stranded. They have set off flash-bang grenades in crowds. ICE even arrested U.S. citizens based on how they looked.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is this conduct that is causing people to go out in the streets and peacefully protest.

President Trump's deployment of troops only escalated tensions and caused further unrest. Democrats have been clear. Anyone who commits violence must be held accountable. We must recognize that peaceful protests are patriotic. Deploying troops to silence dissent is not.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution ignores those facts to score political points, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the assertion has been made repeatedly that the President's deployment of the Guard escalated tensions. We have seen zero evidence for that. We all saw the images of the horrifying violence that occurred before the Guard came in.

For my colleagues who continue to assert that there was something untoward about the President deploying the Guard, I would also remind them that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled otherwise.

In a unanimous decision, the court analyzed the relevant statute which provides that the President has the authority to make use of the Guard in order to stop the execution of Federal law from being disrupted.

The judges looked at the facts on the ground and said when Molotov cocktails are thrown at officers, when a commercial dumpster is used as a battering ram in order to break into a Federal office building's parking lot, when roadways are shut down, this looks a lot like there is a disruption of the ability to carry out Federal law.

Again, it is not me saying this. This is a unanimous panel of Trump-appointed and Biden-appointed judges who came to that determination.

I will happily answer the question of my friend from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) about what is the question when it comes to agriculture. Here is what the law says. The law says that coming into this country without authorization is categorically illegal.

Then it is within the discretion of the executive branch how to prioritize deportations. Across party lines, there has always been a strong focus on prioritizing those with criminal records. Beyond that, different Presidents have chosen to exercise that discretion in different ways.

For example, President Obama chose to deport millions of people during his time in office. It is ultimately a matter of how the President chooses to carry out that policy.

Here is the important point for purposes of today's debate. Whatever a person's views are on that matter, whether they favor deporting everyone in the country illegally or whether they favor deporting no one in the country illegally, we should not, cannot, and absolutely must not use violence in order to advance that point of view.

That is the principle at stake in today's debate. To vote against this resolution is to countenance what happened with the horrifying events we saw in my State.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are getting somewhere in this debate. The gentleman concedes that it is within the discretion of the administration to decide where to target resources.

I was just trying to find out where the administration is this week because we are getting conflicting accounts of whether or not they are still targeting farmworkers. We are getting reports from California, Texas, and New Mexico that entire farms are shut down because there have been ICE raids. The other workers are afraid to come to work.

They are begging the President to do something. The President then said we would stop doing that. Then they reversed it when Stephen Miller got involved. I think now the agriculture interests are getting involved. They should get the policy together.

It speaks to an underlying problem here, which is that the overwhelming number of arrests now are not of people who are criminal suspects for anything. Mr. Speaker, 65 percent of the people who have been taken by ICE since this administration began had no criminal convictions at all.

That is why we read articles in The Wall Street Journal about small, rural towns that voted for Donald Trump. They are up in arms and are in an uproar because people who have done nothing wrong and are pillars of the community are being taken away from their workplaces, their farms, their restaurants, their businesses, and their homes.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), who I know to be a serious student of the law because he was a student of mine of the law when we were at Yale Law School together: What authorizes the govern-

ment to send people out who are not identified with any law enforcement insignia, who are masked and who are in unmarked cars, to arrest people? Doesn't that set the people up for danger in America?

That is what the assassins in Minnesota were doing. They showed up, dressed like some kind of vague police person without any law enforcement insignia, and in an unmarked car. That sets us up for danger.

Doesn't my colleague think the law enforcement norm is for people to know who police officers are so that they know they have to submit to their authority? I would inquire if my colleague would like to answer the question.

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

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, if it is true that law enforcement is somehow never allowed to be in something other than their uniform, I think there are a lot of people who have gotten tickets for running a stop sign, when there was an unmarked car there, who would be happy to hear that. They now have a new basis to challenge that.

I think we are all aware that there are circumstances, like when someone is undercover or when they are doing a stakeout, in which it doesn't make sense for the official to identify himself as an officer.

Of course, that is neither here nor there because in these very targeted operations, we have seen that these folks are very clearly identified. To the extent that some have chosen to not have their faces revealed, it is because we have seen the threats against ICE absolutely skyrocket over the last several months.

It is, again, quite ironic when there were folks on that side of the aisle who were all about masks in the most absurd of settings during the COVID years. We had people playing singles tennis or out on the ocean paddleboarding required to wear a mask. There were 2-year-olds wearing a mask all day when no other country did this.

Yet when Federal officers, undertaking dangerous activity, trying to do their jobs, yet facing threats, being doxed and feeling like they and their family are at risk, choose to take this protective measure, now my colleague has a problem with it?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there are masked agents in unmarked cars sent out, violating people's due process rights, as the courts have found. This includes all the way up to the Supreme Court. They are arresting Members of Congress. They are prosecuting Members of Congress for doing their jobs. They federalize the State National Guard when the police in Los Angeles and the elected officials are doing their jobs.

This is an authoritarian attack on constitutional democracy. We must get back to the rule of law.

If nothing else, the Republicans should put up the plaque they committed to put up, honoring the police officers who defended American democracy, the Vice President of the United States, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and everybody in this room during the January 6 violent insurrection which Donald Trump was impeached for having incited.

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

□ 1010

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, what happened in L.A. put on stark display years of reckless and failed policies, starting with the millions of people who came across the border illegally during the Biden years and then the sanctuary policies that California has enacted, not to mention the countless people who have been released from prison early thanks to reckless crime policies.

Today's resolution is not about any of that. Today's resolution is about something much simpler, a notion that I would hope would be unobjectionable: that in this country we settle our differences through reasoned arguments and debate and not through force and violence, that we make political decisions through elections and not through riots.

I hope that this resolution will receive strong bipartisan support on the floor today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 195, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Boebert	Crank
Alford	Bost	Crawford
Allen	Bresnahan	Crenshaw
Amodeli (NV)	Burchett	Cuellar
Arrington	Burlison	Davidson
Babin	Calvert	Davis (NC)
Bacon	Cammack	De La Cruz
Baird	Carey	Donalds
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Downing
Barr	Carter (TX)	Dunn (FL)
Barrett	Ciscomani	Edwards
Baumgartner	Cline	Ellzey
Bean (FL)	Cloud	Emmer
Begich	Clyde	Estes
Bentz	Cole	Evans (CO)
Bergman	Collins	Ezell
Bice	Comer	Fallon
Biggs (AZ)	Costa	Feenstra
Biggs (SC)	Crane	Fine

Finstad	Kiggans (VA)
Fischbach	Kiley (CA)
Fitzgerald	Kim
Fitzpatrick	Knott
Fleischmann	Kustoff
Flood	LaHood
Fong	LaLota
Fox	LaMalfa
Franklin, Scott	Langworthy
Fry	Latta
Fulcher	Lawler
Garbarino	Lee (FL)
Gill (TX)	Letlow
Gillen	Loudermilk
Golden (ME)	Lucas
Goldman (TX)	Luttrell
Gonzales, Tony	Mace
Gooden	Mackenzie
Gosar	Malliotakis
Gray	Maloy
Green (TN)	Mann
Greene (GA)	Massie
Griffith	Mast
Grothman	McCauley
Guest	McClain
Guthrie	McClintock
Hageman	McCormick
Hamadeh (AZ)	McDowell
Haridopolos	McGuire
Harrigan	Messmer
Harris (MD)	Meuser
Harris (NC)	Miller (IL)
Harshbarger	Miller (OH)
Hern (OK)	Miller-Meeks
Higgins (LA)	Mills
Hill (AR)	Moolenaar
Hinson	Moore (AL)
Houchin	Moore (NC)
Hudson	Moore (UT)
Huizenga	Moore (WV)
Hunt	Moran
Hurd (CO)	Murphy
Issa	Nehls
Jack	Newhouse
James	Norman
Johnson (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Johnson (SD)	Obermole
Jordan	Ogles
Joyce (OH)	Onder
Joyce (PA)	Owens
Kean	Palmer
Kelly (MS)	Patronis
Kelly (PA)	Perry

NAYS—195

Adams	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	DeBene	Kennedy (NY)
Amo	Deluzio	Khanna
Ansari	DeSaulnier	Krishnamoorthi
Auchincloss	Dexter	Landsman
Balint	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Barragan	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Bell	Elfreth	Latimer
Bera	Escobar	Lee (NV)
Beyer	Espallat	Lee (PA)
Bishop	Evans (PA)	Leger Fernandez
Bonamici	Fields	Levin
Boyle (PA)	Figures	Liccardo
Brown	Fletcher	Lieu
Brownley	Foster	Lofgren
Budzinski	Foushee	Lynch
Bynum	Frankel, Lois	Magaziner
Carbajal	Friedman	Mannion
Carson	Frost	Matsui
Carter (LA)	Garcia (CA)	McBath
Casar	Garcia (IL)	McBride
Case	Garcia (TX)	McClain Delaney
Casten	Gomez	McClellan
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez, V.	McCollum
Castro (TX)	Goodlander	McDonald Rivet
Cherfilus-	Gottheimer	McGarvey
McCormick	Green, Al (TX)	McGovern
Chu	Harder (CA)	McIver
Cisneros	Hayes	Meeks
Clark (MA)	Himes	Menendez
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Meng
Cleaver	Houlahan	Mfume
Clyburn	Hoyer	Min
Cohen	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (WI)
Conaway	Huffman	Morelle
Correa	Ivey	Morrison
Courtney	Jacobs	Moulton
Craig	Jayapal	Mrvan
Crockett	Jeffries	Mullin
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Neguse
Davis (IL)	Kamlager-Dove	Norcross
Dean (PA)	Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez
DeGette	Keating	Olszewski

Omar	Scanlon	Titus
Pallone	Schneider	Tlaib
Panetta	Scholten	Tokuda
Pappas	Schrier	Tonko
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Torres (CA)
Peters	Scott, David	Torres (NY)
Pettersen	Sewell	Trahan
Pingree	Sherman	Tran
Pocan	Simon	Underwood
Pou	Sorensen	Vargas
Pressley	Soto	Vasquez
Quigley	Stansbury	Veasey
Ramirez	Stanton	Velázquez
Randall	Stevens	Vindman
Raskin	Strickland	Wasserman
Riley (NY)	Subramanyam	Schultz
Rivas	Swallow	Waters
Ross	Sykes	Watson Coleman
Ruiz	Takano	Whitesides
Ryan	Thanedar	Williams (GA)
Salinas	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Sánchez	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—22

Beatty	Gimenez	Moskowitz
Billakis	Goldman (NY)	Neal
Brecheen	Graves	Perez
Buchanan	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	Jackson (TX)	Sherrill
Diaz-Balart	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (WA)
Fedorchak	Luna	
Garamendi	Miller (WV)	

□ 1038

Messrs. LOUDERMILK and COSTA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 185.

Mr. BRECHEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was was unavoidably detained due to illness and was not able to cast my vote on Roll Call No. 185. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 185.

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed the vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 185.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the vote in the House chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 185.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed today's vote. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 185.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 27, 2025.

I hereby designate the period from Friday, June 27, 2025, through Sunday, July 6, 2025, as a “district work period” under clause 13 of Rule I.

MIKE JOHNSON,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### RECOGNIZING HILLSBORO HIGH SCHOOL LADY INDIANS

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1