

leaves with us. Miranda is not going far. She will be working for the Committee on Appropriations under my dear friend and fellow Oklahoman, Chairman TOM COLE.

As she embarks on her next chapter, I have no doubt her career will continue to flourish, inspiring us all. I thank Miranda for her service and for making Oklahoma stronger.

#### RECOGNIZING MAGGIE MANCINELLI-CAHILL

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous contributions of Maggie Mancinelli-Cahill, Producing Artistic Director of the Capital Repertory Theatre, as she retires from her storied career bringing the joy of live theater to patrons across the capital region and beyond.

Since 1995, Maggie has directed more than 125 productions, workshops, and readings, helping to cement the repertory as a treasured cornerstone of both the city of Albany and the wider theater community. The warmth of her personality would always shine through as she enthusiastically welcomed audiences at the start of so many shows.

Throughout her three decades at the repertory, Maggie nurtured local artists and performers, while sharing her own illustrious talents and creativity with a grateful audience.

Countless local organizations have recognized Maggie's abundance of vision, resilience, and, yes, optimism. While the curtain is closing on this act of Maggie's brilliant career, I know her theatrical artistry will continue to inspire our community for years to come.

Bravo, Maggie, bravo. Congratulations.

#### REMEMBERING DUANE ANKNEY

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of former Montana State Senator Duane Ankney, known to many as the "King of Coal."

Elected to the State legislature in 2006 from Colstrip, Montana, which he proudly called the heartbeat of eastern Montana, Senator Ankney was a steadfast advocate for the working men and women who power our State. He understood the value of coal not just as a resource but a way of life for thousands of Montanans.

Throughout his service, he championed energy independence, defended rural jobs, and gave a voice to communities too often overlooked. Senator Ankney wasn't afraid to speak hard truths or to take tough stands. He led with grit, with principle, and a deep love for Montana.

Today, we remember him as more than a legislator. We remember him as a fighter. He was a friend and a champion to the people he served.

#### PROTECTING AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, our Department of Defense is charged with protecting America's critical infrastructure. Our current standards are simply insufficient. The United States is vulnerable to attack on our defense infrastructure by our adversaries, as we were reminded of today like no other.

Fortifying our defense critical infrastructure is imperative, and funding it is our job. My amendment No. 269 directs a comprehensive review of current interagency coordination of DOD implementation to ensure physical and cybersecurity for our air, rail, and maritime infrastructure that underpins our military readiness.

My amendment No. 270 directs our Secretary of State with developing a comprehensive strategy to counter Iran's and Hezbollah's missionary and propaganda operations in Latin America.

Iran's goal in Latin America is to export its ideology to the region, so as to cultivate anti-Americanism in our Western Hemisphere. There must be a clear plan and strategy to counter their malign influence.

Mr. Speaker, these two amendments were unanimously passed yesterday and included in the National Defense Authorization Act, and I thank my colleagues for supporting these amendments.

□ 0910

#### STOP ILLEGAL ENTRY ACT OF 2025

Mr. KNOTT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 682, I call up the bill (H.R. 3486) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally enter and reenter the United States after being removed, 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 (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 682, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 119-255, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3486

*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 "Stop Illegal Entry Act of 2025".*

#### SEC. 2. COMMISSION OF CRIMES BY ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

*Section 275 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1325) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a), by striking "2 years" and inserting "5 years"; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following:*

*"(e) Any alien—*

*"(1) who—*

*"(A) enters or attempts to enter the United States at any time or place other than as designated by immigration officers,*

*"(B) eludes examination or inspection by immigration officers, or*

*"(C) attempts to enter or obtains entry to the United States by a willfully false or misleading representation or the willful concealment of a material fact, and*

*"(2) thereafter is convicted of any crime punishable by more than 1 year of imprisonment, may be fined under title 18, United States Code, and shall be imprisoned not less than 5 years and may be imprisoned for any term of years or for life."*

#### SEC. 3. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR REENTRY OF REMOVED ALIEN.

*Section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1326) is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;*

*(2) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:*

*"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), any alien who—*

*"(1) has been denied admission, excluded, deported, removed, or has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding; and*

*"(2) thereafter enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, unless—*

*"(A) prior to the alien's reembarkation at a place outside the United States or the alien's application for admission from foreign contiguous territory, the Secretary of Homeland Security has expressly consented to such alien's reapplying for admission; or*

*"(B) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, such alien establishes that the alien was not required to obtain such advance consent under this or any prior Act,*

*shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.*

*"(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR REENTRY OF CERTAIN REMOVED ALIENS.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the penalty under subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (c), an alien described in subsection (a)—*

*"(A) who was convicted before such removal or departure of 3 or more misdemeanors involving drugs, crimes against the person, or both shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both;*

*"(B) who has been excluded from the United States pursuant to section 235(c) because the alien was inadmissible under section 212(a)(3)(B) or who has been removed from the United States pursuant to the provisions of title V, and who thereafter, without the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security, enters the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned for a period of 10 years, which sentence shall not run concurrently with any other sentence;*

*"(C) who was removed from the United States pursuant to section 241(a)(4)(B) who thereafter, without the permission of the Secretary of Homeland Security, enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and*

*“(D) who has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed 3 or more times and thereafter enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in the United States, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.”*

*“(2) REMOVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection and in subsection (c), the term ‘removal’ includes any agreement in which an alien stipulates to removal during (or not during) a criminal trial under either Federal or State law.”*

*“(c) MANDATORY MINIMUM CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR REENTRY OF CERTAIN REMOVED ALIENS.—Notwithstanding the penalties provided in subsections (a) and (b), an alien described in subsection (a) who was convicted before such removal or departure of—*

*“(1) any aggravated felony;*

*“(2) any crime defined as a felony by the relevant jurisdiction (Federal, State, Tribal, or local) of conviction; or*

*“(3) any crime punishable by more than 1 year of imprisonment, may be fined under title 18, United States Code, and shall be imprisoned not less than 10 years and may be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.”; and*

*(4) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—*

*(A) by striking “section 242(h)(2)” and inserting “section 241(a)(4)”;* and

*(B) by striking “Attorney General” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.*

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 North Carolina (Mr. KNOTT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3486.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to open remarks on this important legislation which holds a specific criminal category to account, specifically those who exploit weak border policies to bring crime into the United States.

I certainly feel that it is appropriate, before I begin my remarks, to note that today is the 24th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, and in that same vein, Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation profoundly enables law enforcement to protect us from all threats that seek to enter our country illegally.

Let me begin by commending Congresswoman BICE for partnering with me on this important issue.

As to the bill, Mr. Speaker, no matter the type or category, all crime is made worse by illegal immigration. Theft, assault, murder, drug trafficking, human trafficking, violent crime, and property crime, you name

it, Mr. Speaker, illegal immigration makes it worse.

What is perhaps most unfortunate is that many of the worst offenders in this specific category return to the United States after being deported due to gaps in the current immigration law.

As a former U.S. prosecutor, I saw how deportation alone is insufficient to deter the committed illegal immigrant criminal. I have investigated, tried, and convicted many individuals who had been deported 2 times, 3 times, 4 times, and some even beyond 10 times. Yet, they continue to illegally return with the sole intent—the sole intent—to commit crime here in the United States.

The original version of this bill, Mr. Speaker, was drafted after a 32-year-old woman, an American woman, was tragically murdered by an illegal alien who had five felony convictions and had been deported multiple times from the United States. Tragically, her case is not an outlier. It has become far too common.

Under the current law, we must wait for a repeat felon, a recidivist illegal alien, to harm another American before we can effectively punish him or her for the crimes they seek to commit.

Enough is enough.

For any illegal immigrant who has demonstrated a clear and perverse disregard for our law, this bill shows that we will not wait for them to harm another American before we punish them. The act of returning after deportation is a serious crime, and it should denote serious consequences.

Further, if a person is here illegally, commissioning and being convicted of a felony is not a victimless crime. All felonies have a victim.

Enough is enough.

In the current state of the law, we must wait for an American to be harmed before significant punishments are issued to those who are here illegally. That is the core motivation of the changes being sought in this bill.

Candidly and specifically, if a person is here illegally with demonstrated criminal intent, that alone is sufficient to be punished meaningfully in this country.

Utilizing my own experience prosecuting this specific class of criminal, this bill implements the following commonsense provisions.

First, if any illegal alien is found guilty of a State or Federal felony, that alone qualifies the illegal alien for a new Federal charge that will bring a minimum of 5 years in Federal prison.

Secondly, rather than capping the sentence for illegally reentering—again, this is not the first attempt—illegally reentering the country at 2 years in prison, which is, again, the current state of the law, the new maximum would become 10 years for all illegal reentries regardless of the criminal history that they have.

Thirdly, if an illegal alien is convicted of any felony and then deported,

and that illegal alien attempts to enter the country illegally again, that will qualify the illegal alien for a new Federal charge that carries a minimum of 10 years and up to life in Federal prison.

I want to make it very clear that this bill does nothing to remove the current immigration authority. If a swift deportation is sought, it can be achieved. If apprehension for an underlying crime and prosecution is sought, that is within the discretion of law enforcement and the prosecutor. This merely adds new tools with which we can fight illegal immigrant criminals.

The premise of the bill, Mr. Speaker, begins with the reality that anyone who is in the country illegally is guilty of criminal conduct. However, what triggers the enhanced penalties is either illegal reentry—illegal reentry—after deportation or a felony conviction within the United States.

Let me be clear to preempt some of the concerns on the other side of the aisle. This bill adheres to strict and constitutionally protected due process, requiring a conviction in a court of law to trigger the enhanced penalties while leaving room for discretion as the prosecutor deems necessary.

Yes, we need the law. Yes, we need deportations. Yes, we need to remove those who are here illegally, especially those who have committed crimes that harm Americans. The President has shown that these steps are essential. However, from my firsthand experience, from my conversations with these criminals, and from the crime data that is all over this country, sophisticated criminal networks with vast resources extend their reach into America due to the open-border policies that the left seems so committed to.

It is only through maintaining the policies of this President and strengthening deterrence that we can ensure that illegal immigrant criminals do not continue to flood this country.

We must send a message to those around the world who want to come here to commit harm: Our tolerance for that activity is over.

With the tools in this bill, investigators and prosecutors will be better able to dismantle organized crime rings across America. Most importantly, they will employ an efficient deterrent to anybody who seeks to enter or reenter this country illegally.

□ 0920

It is time for the illegal immigrant criminals to know that we are finished tolerating their presence with the illegal activity that they engage in.

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

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

I congratulate Mr. KNOTT on his first bill coming to the floor of the House.

The administration and ICE say that they are targeting the most hardened criminals, the worst of the worst, but

the numbers now suggest a different story. Roughly half of the people who have been arrested by ICE have no violent criminal history and no criminal history other than being undocumented.

Most migrants, of course, are coming due to poverty, insecurity, violence in their home country, and authoritarianism at home. In fact, the two most common crimes committed by people who have been detained by ICE are being here without documentation and traffic offenses.

Now, the President has said that his administration wants to remove and deport people who commit crimes after they illegally enter the country, but the gentleman's legislation moves in exactly the opposite direction. If this bill were passed into law, it would imprison people for long sentences, even potentially for life, just for having entered the country on an undocumented basis, several times, as the gentleman says.

Obviously, if someone commits a murder or rape, they are going to be prosecuted for murder or rape, so the bite of this bill is with respect to people who just keep reentering our country without permission.

Now, it would require that people who are immediately removable and deportable, undocumented immigrants, must spend 5 or 10 years in overcrowded and overburdened Bureau of Prisons facilities in our country at a huge cost to American taxpayers—more than \$150, and in many cases \$200 a day, which comes to hundreds of millions of dollars when you multiply it by the people that would be affected—before they can be removed from the country.

That is the odd part of this bill, that we have people who have entered unlawfully who have no documentation to be here. They are removable. They are deportable, but we are insisting that they stay here and be imprisoned and punished here for the crime of having entered illegally.

This would undoubtedly be good for the owners of all the private detention facilities and prisons who are getting rich off of laws like this, but it would fail the rest of us.

Under 8 U.S.C. 1325, today, entering the U.S. without inspection is already a misdemeanor punishable by a fine and a sentence of up to 6 months in prison with enhancements that can increase the maximum sentence up to 2 years. Under 8 U.S.C. 1326, if you unlawfully reenter the country or are found to be here in the United States following a removal or denial of admission, this is already a felony punishable by up to 2 years in prison with enhancements that can increase the maximum sentence already to as high as 20 years in prison for those who were ordered removed following a conviction for certain offenses.

The gentleman's bill would increase the penalty for people who enter without inspection from 6 months to 2

years for a first offense, and then if you reenter without documentation for up to 5 years, and in certain circumstances, potentially up to life. You could be held for life for a consecutive illegal entry into our country.

The bill provides even for a potential life sentence in Federal prison for merely entering the country unlawfully with no other criminal conduct required. There are obviously armed robbers and rapists and even murderers who have done less time than that.

Obviously, we don't want these people entering the country illegally. That is why the solution is to toughen the border. We had a bipartisan compromise to toughen and fortify the border with the hiring of hundreds more border officers and judges. It was coming through the Senate. That was the one at the end of 2024 that was sailing through Congress when President Trump decided to sink that legislation and said, essentially, that he didn't want a border compromise bill for more effective enforcement there, that he wanted a border crisis to run against.

There has been a consensus between the parties for several years that mandatory minimums do not effectively reduce crime and do not improve public safety. They strip judges of their ability to exercise fact-based discretion and impose sentences that fit the circumstances of the case, frustrating their ability to consider mitigating and complicating factors, imposing a one-size-fits-all straitjacket that leads to often disproportionate and inflexible prison sentences.

This is why the Judicial Conference itself opposes mandatory minimums. This is why you don't have judges at the border demanding the gentleman's legislation. This is why the Brennan Center opposes it. This is why Right On Crime has opposed mandatory minimums and so on.

Study after study has shown that mandatory minimums don't work to deter criminal conduct. We know from a report issued by the Department of Justice's National Institute of Justice that the certainty of being caught and quickly punished, not the severity or length of the sentence, is what deters criminal conduct. Increasing and mandating harsh, lengthy sentences will not deter illegal reentry, but strengthening the border will do that.

According to The Washington Post, the administration is actually pressuring Governors today to commute the sentences of immigrants who are in prison under the current framework convicted of serious crimes. I am not talking about just entering without documentation. I am talking about serious crimes. The administration is pushing for them to have their sentences commuted so ICE can take custody of them and then remove them from the country more quickly.

The gentleman's bill does the exact opposite. It requires the deportable immigrants be held in our prisons at

enormous public expense for 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, in some circumstances even for life, making the taxpayers pay for it when they could have simply been removed and deported, which has been the policy of this administration.

The gentleman's bill, which was opposed on a bipartisan basis in committee, is ultimately too punitive, way too expensive, and ultimately ineffective.

I will urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, with all due respect to my friend.

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

Mr. KNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague, Representative KNOTT, for bringing forth this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if we reward illegals for breaking our laws, we cannot be surprised when it continues to happen.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3486, the Stop Illegal Entry Act, legislation to increase penalties for aliens who commit serious crimes, as well as those who enter illegally more than once.

We all know under the Biden administration, illegal immigrants were welcomed with open arms. They were given hotel rooms, cell phones, plane tickets, and work authorization. I am glad to report those days are over.

House Republicans are united behind President Trump's efforts to secure our border, strengthen our immigration enforcement, and fix our immigration system.

Earlier this year, House Republicans made a once-in-a-generation investment in our immigration system. We gave our immigration officers the resources they need to properly enforce our immigration laws and carry out necessary deportations.

Today, we are building upon that work with this proposed law to provide a strong deterrent against those coming here illegally in the first place.

□ 0930

With these enhanced punishments in place, people will think twice before breaking our laws and choosing to overwhelm our immigration system. The harsher the punishment, the more the deterrence. That is just common sense.

A nation that cannot control its borders cannot protect its people. This legislation affirms the rule of law, defends American families from dangerous criminal aliens, and restores accountability to our immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3486.

This bill is Republicans' latest attempt to scapegoat and fearmonger about immigrants. With President Trump's poll numbers tanking on immigration due to his kidnapping and disappearing of immigrants and U.S. citizens off our streets, House Republicans are, once again, looking to turn the conversation back to immigration and the border.

I will point out the absurdity of spending this valuable floor time on a bill that has harsh and ineffective mandatory minimums for immigrants while the majority effects one of the greatest coverups of our time, covering up the horrific abuses of Jeffrey Epstein and his network of child traffickers and sexual predators.

Why not spend our time focused on justice for the incredibly brave survivors who have spoken out against the rich and powerful men who abused them?

Why fight a bipartisan discharge petition from THOMAS MASSIE and RO KHANNA to release all of the damned files, not just the ones that the Trump's DOJ allows to be released?

Why not speak out against the cushy deal that Ghislaine Maxwell just got from Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche to move to a cushy prison instead of serving her time as one of Epstein's main co-conspirators and groomers of young girls to be abused by Epstein and his cohort of rich and powerful men?

Obviously, once again, my colleagues across the aisle want to try to distract us by returning to their tried-and-true playbook of demonizing immigrants. That is not actually what the American people want. We have seen over and over again that the American people actually support immigration, despite all of the lies that come from the other side.

This summer, a Gallup poll noted a record high, 79 percent, of U.S. adults say that immigration is a good thing for the country. A Pew poll showed 64 percent of Americans disapprove of President Trump's suspension of most asylum applications, which was ruled unlawful in Federal court.

The American people now see that the Trump administration has continually lied about what they are going to do on immigration. According to a CBS poll, a majority of Americans believe that the Trump administration is not prioritizing the removal of dangerous criminals and public safety threats, and nearly 60 percent disapprove of how the Trump administration is using immigration detention facilities.

This is not surprising in the least. As the ranking member said, ICE's own data revealed that roughly 65 percent of people in immigration detention have zero criminal convictions—zero.

It is clear that this administration is not targeting the so-called worst of the worst, as President Trump claimed on the campaign trail. Instead, they are

targeting everyone that they think they may be able to deport.

Tom Homan, the President's so-called border czar, said that arresting noncriminals is "... our job."

In Los Angeles, ICE has been racially profiling people, indiscriminately arresting and holding people, causing fear and terror in people of every legal status who simply look Latino or speak Spanish or congregate on certain corners.

Today's bill is just more of the same scapegoating and lying about immigrants. Once again, the majority implies that, somehow, we don't already have consequences for unlawful entry and reentry. That is absolutely false. Current law already includes harsh sentences and are some of the most prosecuted laws in our country every single year. This bill would add ridiculous mandatory minimum sentences, potentially going up to life, onto the crimes of unlawful entry and reentry.

Mr. Speaker, this makes no sense on multiple levels. If the administration is seeking to deport "the worst of the worst," why put them into incarceration facilities? Perhaps this is just another ploy to give private, for-profit prison companies more money so that they can build more facilities, make more profit, and, ultimately, contribute more to the Republican campaign coffers.

In addition, as the ranking member said in his statement, mandatory minimums just do not work. We have actually seen this over and over again. Harsh enforcement is not the answer. I don't know why my colleagues are having such a hard time with this.

The first Trump administration actually tried to weaponize unlawful entry prosecutions by separating over 5,000 children from their parents. The entire country—Republican, Independent, and Democrat—was horrified at this, and the administration, ultimately, had to abandon their family separation policy.

Still, today, over 1,000 of these kids remain separated from their parents. Yet, despite this despicable, absurdly cruel policy, a 2018 study found zero—zero statistically significant relationship between the family separation policy and the number of apprehensions at the border.

These kinds of indiscriminate, harsh enforcement efforts are a waste of taxpayer dollars and detrimental to the kind of country that we are trying to create. The U.S. already has the highest incarceration rate of any country in the world, and it costs U.S. taxpayers about \$182 billion every year, not to mention the social cost to lock up nearly 1 percent of the adult population. This bill would skyrocket that number.

Actually, it was during the first Trump term that Republicans joined Democrats in actually rolling back some mandatory minimum sentences in the First Step Act that was signed by—guess who—President Donald

Trump himself in 2018. Yet, I guess all good policy is, once again, falling to the feet of the divisive political rhetoric around immigrants and crime that my colleagues across the aisle have embraced as their salvo to save them from the bleak economic picture that our country faces today: higher joblessness; Trumpflation; a host of reckless policies, including trade wars, that have cost the American people.

The Republican big, bad betrayal bill is unpopular everywhere in the country no matter how you spin it because Americans know that kicking 17 million Americans off of healthcare just so you can give a \$7 trillion tax break to the wealthiest billionaire donors and giant corporations is outrageous, and the American people want us to roll it back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DE LA CRUZ). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, in just 19 days, government funding expires. Right now, Americans across the country face rural hospitals that are closing, higher prices for back-to-school supplies, and double-digit increases in healthcare premiums. What is the Republican majority spending their time on? This terrible bill.

What a giant abdication of the huge responsibility that the American people put on us here in Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. KNOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SCHMIDT).

Mr. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, our colleagues on the other side think that if they just talk about enough other things long enough, the clock will run out and that the American people will forget the disaster that the policies of the prior administration created not just on our border but throughout our communities in this country for the prior 4 years.

They are mistaken. We are not going to forget. We are not going to stop until we fix the holes in our law that enabled bad policies to drive through them.

That is what this bill is about. This bill is about focusing on the worst of the worst. It is about focusing on those who are not deterred under current law by the threat of a 2-year prison sentence. Perhaps it is because they are being paid by the cartels or enabled by the cartels, and the risk is worth it. That is who this is aimed at. That is why a 5- to 10-year prison sentence is warranted, valid, and necessary.

Madam Speaker, I will share just one story from my home State of Kansas about why we care about this issue. This is just one example. In March of 2016, Pablo Antonio Serrano-Vitorino, an illegal alien from Mexico, shot and killed four people in my State. Then, while fleeing from law enforcement, he killed another person in Missouri.

Here is the kicker: It wasn't his first time in the country. It wasn't his first crime in our country. In 2004, he was convicted in California of making a terrorist threat. He was deported, and he came back. In the years that ensued, he encountered law enforcement when he committed battery, when he committed drunk driving, and when he committed traffic infractions. He came back, and he stayed.

□ 0940

I can't say with certainty that if ICE had done their job and shown up, if the prosecutors had actually prosecuted, if the law were tough enough, that none of that would have happened, but I can sure say the odds are much better that those five people might still be alive. I can certainly say that justice would have been done.

This bill is a good first step. We need to do it. It is the right thing.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support it. Let me just say, I hope we don't stop here. Let's put this on the President's desk. Let's keep going and finish the job.

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

My friend and the good gentleman from Kansas says that the legislation is about the worst of the worst, and I beg to differ.

The worst of the worst are already covered by existing law. If you commit a murder like the gruesome murder he describes in his State, you can go to jail for life. In many States—and I suppose Kansas, but I don't know—you are subject to the death penalty. If you commit rape or armed robbery, there are laws that cover that.

Today, under section 1326, if you have committed an aggravated felony such as the kind he describes, you already can be imprisoned for an additional 20 years under the immigration statute.

I understand that it might be satisfying for us to say we are just going to increase all these penalties, but we are not in any way connecting with the worst of the worst. What we are really doing is saying that we are going to hold people who have done nothing other than enter the country illegally for much longer periods of time, for 5 years or 10 years.

Again, we see this as very wasteful in terms of public tax dollars. If we set aside the murderers, the rapists, and the armed robbers, who we are going to get under existing laws that make all of that criminal, and you look at what is actually happening here, it is a focus on people who are entering the country illegally.

We have to ask ourselves, is it economically worthwhile for us to say that we are so mad at those people that we want to hold them in our jails for 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, or even life in certain circumstances rather than send them back to their own country and toughen the border so they can't get back in? That is precisely the purpose of the legislation that was rejected at

the end of 2024 on toughening up the border. We should go back and do that rather than having people continually come back in.

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this measure. Let me repeat: Reentry into this country is already a felony.

Bottom line, if you are a hardcore criminal, with or without documents, you should be fried, period. The one thing about this bill that is lacking is simply this: We don't talk about the big magnet. What is the big magnet for people coming into this country? Jobs.

People come to work. We need the workers. Wisconsin dairy farmers, up to 90 percent of those dairy workers at those Wisconsin dairies are undocumented. Undocumented workers are in manufacturing. They are farmworkers. They are in food processing. Who takes care of our seniors? Mainly, undocumented workers.

I ask my colleagues, is there anything in this bill going out to the employers? What about when those undocumented are deported and come back to the U.S.? Do you say to those employers: You are going to be doubled down, double felony, and you are going to go to prison for life?

That is the big issue here. Who is going to do those jobs?

I ask my colleagues on the other side, let's work on immigration reform. Let's get some visas going for these workers. Instead, the situation we have right now, we tell employers to go ahead and hire an undocumented because they don't have any others to hire. That is the only way they stay in business, but when they do that, they are essentially breaking the law.

Give them the other option. Mr. Employer, fire those undocumented, and guess what? They will go out of business. That is the scenario we have right now.

Let me conclude by telling a story about my district, as well. Mr. Barranco, 25 years in this country, not a traffic ticket to his name, was at the Home Depot doing what he is supposed to do: buy parts and do a job. He got picked up by ICE. His son called me.

This man has three sons, and all three are serving in the U.S. Marine Corps. Alejandro just finished, honorable discharge. The two others are still in the Marine Corps in California.

What do you tell the American public when you tell them that the father of three marines who took an oath to defend this country, to make the ultimate sacrifice for this country, we are deporting their father because he is a criminal?

I asked Alejandro if, at Camp Pendleton, there are other marines in his situation. He said yes. There are plenty of marines there serving our Nation—

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, there are many marines right now whose parents are undocumented who are ready to lay down their lives for this country.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let's work on immigration reform. This does nothing to strengthen our country or our national defense. It hurts our economy. Why are we going down this path?

Let's get serious about immigration reform. Let's pass some laws that enable workers to work legally and let employers hire these workers legally, as well.

Mr. KNOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 3486, the Stop Illegal Entry Act.

Let me first start by saying I think it is rich that we stand here on the House floor and are lectured by the other side of the aisle about immigration issues when they had the last 4 years to actually address this problem. They want to deflect, as my colleague from Kansas mentioned. Let's talk about all the other things that have been happening in the country instead of the actual issue at hand.

Under the Biden administration, over 10 million illegal immigrants entered this country. This includes countless numbers of murderers, rapists, child traffickers, smugglers, and individuals from countries that support terrorism. Customs and Border Patrol caught 400 individuals on the terrorist watch list, leaving us the question of who else was allowed to enter this country undetected.

That is why the Stop Illegal Entry Act is so important. The legislation seeks to discourage migrants from coming to the U.S. illegally and keeps criminal aliens who disregard Federal immigration law out of our American communities.

It is vital that law enforcement officers and Border Patrol officers have the tools they need to hold dangerous criminals accountable and safeguard our communities, and this legislation does just that.

President Trump has delivered on his promise to secure the border, and this legislation provides the tools needed to uphold our laws and remove dangerous criminals.

On that note, I was also encouraged to see a statement of administrative support from the Office of Management and Budget stating that if the legislation were presented to the President, his advisers would recommend that he sign it into law.

□ 0950

Finally, I am not an attorney, but I thank my friend, Congressman KNOTT, for his support in helping get this legislation through the Judiciary Committee. As a former prosecutor, I know he understands the importance of strong policies that safeguard our communities and empower law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 3486—THE STOP ILLEGAL ENTRY ACT OF 2025—REP. BICE, R-OK, AND FIVE COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports passage of H.R. 3486, the Stop Illegal Entry Act of 2025. The previous administration allowed an unprecedented invasion of illegal immigration, resulting in the influx of limitless criminal aliens—including murderers, rapists, child traffickers and smugglers, drug dealers, and more—entering the United States and further enriching foreign terrorist cartels. President Trump took immediate action to seal and secure the border. Now, to ensure long term border security and deter the most heinous illegal criminal aliens from attempting to re-enter the United States, there must be stronger criminal penalties to prevent illegal re-entry following removal.

H.R. 3486 will help discourage the most dangerous criminals from trying to enter, or re-enter, our country by increasing severe criminal and financial penalties. Specifically, the bill would raise the maximum penalty from two years to five years of imprisonment for any illegal alien convicted of re-entering the United States.

The best deterrent against these violent criminals attempting re-entry is the possibility of lengthy jail time. Seventy percent of the aliens charged for illegal reentry in 2023 had criminal records. For example, an off-duty Customs and Border Patrol officer was shot in the face in New York City in July by an illegal alien who was deported and reentered under the previous administration. Last December, a Guatemalan illegal alien, who was previously deported under the first Trump Administration and later illegally re-entered, was indicted for lighting a woman on fire and burning her to death on a New York City subway.

Additionally, H.R. 3486 cracks down on the smuggling of illicit drugs across the border, often through cartel organizations, by imposing the possibility of up to fifteen years in prison for illegal aliens convicted of three or more misdemeanors involving drugs or harm against others, or for illegal aliens who attempt to reenter after being removed three times. An illegal alien who commits a felony would face the chance of life in prison.

If H.R. 3486 were presented to the President in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign it into law.

Mrs. BICE. Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of this important legislation to hold those accountable that are here illegally.

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

I want to underscore something that the gentleman from California said. The whole weight of this bill is on people who are not the hardened criminals. Obviously, we are going to be prosecuting rapists for rape and murderers for murder and so on. He talked about people who are hardworking immigrants, the kind even President Trump described when for a moment he said there wouldn't be immigration raids on farms because the agricultural sector is in crisis and people are saying we need the workers.

Well, I wanted to echo what President Trump said briefly there before he was corrected by Mr. MILLER. I was just in upstate New York in the Adirondacks in the 21st Congressional Dis-

trict represented by Ms. STEFANIK. I met a bunch of dairy farmers there, who told me it was impossible for them to find workers to work the farms. With the additional crackdown on migrant labor, it is pretty much impossible for them to get the workers they need.

What is the economic result of that? Well, they take the citizen laborers they have got, and they do mandatory overtime, so they are working an additional 15, 20, 30 hours per week, then they have got to pay them time-and-a-half under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Therefore, the prices go up now because they are not able to find enough workers to satisfy the demand. Their choice at that point is to either pay the farmers less money, which they can't do because the farmers are already at the breaking point, or they have got to increase prices, and that is what they end up doing.

They have said to the grocers, this is because Congress refuses to work on bipartisan immigration reform. That is why we are seeing inflation in dairy, produce, and across the agricultural sector.

The gentleman is telling us if we are serious about dealing with this, we need to do what we started to do at the end of 2024. We need to have bipartisan commitment to immigration reform, and we need to sit down and work this out the way that prior generations of Americans have done. This is a country that has been built on immigration.

I am afraid that the gentleman's legislation here, which is basically just jacking up a whole series of criminal penalties, doesn't get us out of the economic problems and the immigration policy problems that we are in. It is a distraction. It will be ineffectual, and so it is not going to work to deal with the real crises that we are facing.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will say that my friend from Maryland mentioned robbery, rape, and murder. This bill's goal is to apprehend dangerous criminals before they rob, rape, or murder Americans.

Secondly, and most importantly, referencing a farmworker, if they are here illegally and they do not commit a felony, this bill does not touch them. The only standard that this bill has: Do not come back into the country a second time illegally, and do not get convicted of a felony. How low do you think of the farmworkers that they cannot meet that standard?

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Representative BICE's Stop Illegal Entry Act of 2025, and I applaud my colleague, Mr. KNOTT, for his role in this important piece of legislation.

For too long, open-border policies have left American families at risk.

Under the Biden administration, the vast majority of those charged with illegal reentry already had criminal records. In Utah, we have seen the consequences firsthand.

This July in Salt Lake County, a 43-year-old Mexican national was sentenced for drug trafficking and illegal reentry. He had been deported three times before. When he was arrested, he carried an illegal firearm and more than 9,000 fentanyl pills.

In May, ICE officers in Utah apprehended and removed an illegal immigrant from Guatemala who was facing charges of aggravated sexual assault of a child under the age of 14, after previously being caught and removed twice before.

In January, a 24-year-old Mexican national was charged with the murder of his girlfriend in Utah just one week after being deported for the second time.

These are not isolated cases. They are just a few recent examples from my home State, and there are countless more heartbreaking stories from across the country.

It is clear that the current penalties are not enough to deter this dangerous cycle of illegal reentry. The safety and security of our citizens must never be compromised by those who abuse our system and exploit our borders.

H.R. 3486 protects American families, upholds the rule of law, and keeps our Nation secure by setting real penalties for those who seek to enter our great Nation illegally to commit crimes. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3486. Let's be clear. This bill is not about border security. It is about pouring gasoline on a prison system that is already bloated, broken, and unjust.

While American families are begging us to release the Epstein files, to lower grocery prices, to keep doctors' offices open, to confront mass shootings, Republicans have chosen to waste our time and taxpayer dollars on a bill that criminalizes what is already a crime under Federal law.

This legislation would impose draconian mandatory minimums, even life sentences, for nonviolent acts like returning to reunite with loved ones. That is not justice. That is cruelty. We should be investing in humane immigration policies, not building more cages. Expanding prisons has never made us safer. It rips families apart, disproportionately targeting Black and Brown communities, and it deepens cycles of poverty and punishment that we should be dismantling, not expanding.

Mandatory minimums don't deter migration. They tie judges' hands, treat every case the same, and devastate communities. We don't need



harsher prison sentences. We need pathways and solutions that actually work.

H.R. 3486 is punitive, expensive, and unnecessary. It is waste. It is fraud. It is abuse. I urge my colleagues to stop scapegoating immigrants, stop playing politics with people's lives, and vote "no" on this cruel and cynical bill.

Mr. KNOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I had some prepared remarks, but as I have talked about this and looked at it even more, this is probably one of the most commonsense bills that will come before this Congress.

This bill simply says if someone reenters or if someone commits a felony, that this law applies. These comments from the other side to try to confuse this issue, to misrepresent the issue, make no sense.

Surely, of all of the things in the world that we can disagree on, perhaps we can at least agree that we should not be allowing felons in this country, and that when someone is here illegally and commits a felony that this law ought to apply.

Have not the events of the last recent days shown that we have enough problems already? Why would we want to have felons from outside this country to come in?

I think about what we were talking about a few days ago back in North Carolina—my colleagues Mr. KNOTT and Mr. HARRIS are here—with the senseless murder of the young Ukrainian lady on the light-rail line. It turns out, by the way, that she and her family lived in my district. Then, of course, there is also the senseless murder yesterday, the assassination of Charlie Kirk, and the violence and evil that is all around us. This is one step to try to prevent and stem even more of that possibly happening. It is by dealing with dangerous folks, not just folks who come across the border for the first time and are dealt with in the normal way, but dealing with folks who are committing serious felonies.

This should be common sense. This is the kind of bill that should get 435 votes on the floor of this House. I hope my colleagues on the other side will reflect on this, will reconsider, and will do the right thing and vote for this bill.

□ 1000

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOTT. 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, I have just one quick correction or amendment to my distinguished friend's last set of remarks, which is that when he says how low a standard must there be, all they

have to do is not commit another felony or commit a felony. As I understand the gentleman's legislation—and please correct me if I am wrong, because he certainly knows it better than I do—it is a felony to come back to the country again without having committed any violent crime or any other offense. It becomes a felony under the legislation. Now you have a felony because you have reentered, and at that point you are eligible for up to 20 years or even a life sentence.

Am I understanding that correctly? There are people whose only offense could be reentering without anything else who would be subject to the most serious punishment.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield if he can just clarify that.

Mr. KNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RASKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KNOTT. The issue with your characterization, sir, is number one, someone who enters illegally must be convicted of illegally entering the country. Then they must be convicted of illegally reentering the country to get a felony conviction. There is no compulsion to charge the most serious layers of this offense. There is prosecutorial discretion.

Under this law, if someone is apprehended, they can be deported without any charging, and that is where the misconception and the mischaracterization is.

If someone is convicted of illegal reentry and deported and they come back, a prosecutor would have the discretion to charge the 10-year minimum. It is not compulsory. It is within the discretion but, yes, he would meet the element.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time. I thank my colleague for that clarification.

Madam Speaker, I am satisfied to believe, again, that there are people who could end up with the most severe penalties under the legislation who have done nothing other than reenter the country, which is something we don't want them to do, which is why we want a bipartisan immigration bill to actually fasten down the border and move forward on this so we are not constantly dealing with this.

The bottom-line problem with my friend's legislation, which is offered in all good faith, is that it is just continuing to pile criminal penalties on people reentering the country without changing any of the incentives or inducements. It doesn't deal with any of the things pushing them out of countries that are marked by violence, gang violence, authoritarianism, and so on, nor is it dealing, as Mr. CORREA points out, with the pull of all of the jobs here.

We need real immigration policy breakthroughs and not just piling on a bunch of additional criminal penalties that are not going to work. If they did work, they would just end up costing

the American taxpayers hundreds of millions or billions of dollars in holding people in our prisons for offenses that currently they are being held for 6 months or for up to 2 years.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's legislation.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot from the other side about costs, whether it be costs to law enforcement, costs to imprison, costs to society. I want to talk about the costs of open-border policies that is felt in this country.

In the year 1990, roughly 5,000 Americans died because of illegal drug use. Since the year 2000, almost 1.5 million Americans have lost their life because of using illegal drugs. Of course, there is involvement locally and domestically in the drug trade, but just about all drugs—statistically, all illegal drugs—come into the country illegally. That is just one category dealing with the cost of illegal immigration.

Any criminal code should have three objectives:

First, it should protect Americans. It should protect American children. It should protect American families, neighborhoods, and businesses from the ill effects of crime.

Second, it should punish illegal activity. When someone harms another American, there should be adequate and reciprocal punishment. It should be efficient, and it should work, again, to protect Americans.

Thirdly, it should deter ongoing criminal conduct in that same vein, repeat criminal offenses, or anyone who would want to copy criminal conduct to enrich themselves.

When you look at the scale of illegal immigration, when you look at the problems that are being inflicted upon this country across every metric, the criminal law is failing to protect Americans.

This bill, again, aims to target the committed criminals who are here illegally. There is no distinction under the current law for people who commit crimes when they are here illegally versus those who commit crimes who are citizens. That discrepancy enables hordes of illegal immigrants to come from around the world to harm Americans.

Again, I repeat, Mr. RASKIN, in good faith and with sound logic, talked about robbery. He talked about property crimes. He talked about rape and murder. Some of these people have been convicted of rape, murder, property crimes after they have been deported. They return illegally and harm Americans.

This bill aims to preempt the harm Americans feel by committed illegal immigrant criminals.

Just this week, there was a release from the Department of Homeland Security. A 34-year-old gang member

from Mexico had illegally entered the country 26 times. He has received convictions for burglary, tampering with government records, government witnesses, criminal enterprises, illegal re-entry multiple times. When you look at cases like this that are so voluminous, it is hard to summarize. Again, the only conclusion—the only conclusion is the law is insufficient as it is currently drafted.

We are in Congress to make laws to protect Americans. When we have such gaping holes in our criminal justice law as it relates to illegal immigrant criminals, not dairy workers, not those who are not committing crimes, the conclusion is straightforward. We need to change the law.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle candidly are twisting themselves into circles to defend the policies of the status quo. They want more illegal immigrants. They do not want stricter enforcement. They are turning every opportunity to resist the changes that Republicans and this President are trying to implement.

Again, as a Federal prosecutor in my previous career, I saw how illegal, unchecked immigration harmed every corner of my State and the country. When you have an open flow of illegal immigration, crime flourishes. It is hard to quantify the cost.

Again, with this bill, for any illegal immigrant to be under its effect, they must commit a felony and get convicted or they must illegally reenter—not enter—reenter after deportation. That is not a standard too high. That is not detached from logic.

Again, when you look at the goals of what all criminal laws should achieve, protecting Americans, punishing illegal activity, and to deter repeat offenses, this is a needed step to accompany the legitimate approach that the President has been implementing over the past few years.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

□ 1010

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 682, 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. Madam 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.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3944; and

Passage of H.R. 3486.

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

## MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3944, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3944) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 213, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—211

Adams	Daids (KS)	Huffman
Aguilar	Davis (IL)	Ivey
Amo	Davis (NC)	Jackson (IL)
Ansari	Dean (PA)	Jacobs
Auchincloss	DeGette	Jayapal
Balint	DeLauro	Jeffries
Barragán	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Beatty	Deluzio	Johnson (TX)
Bell	DeSaulnier	Kamlager-Dove
Bera	Dexter	Kaptur
Beyer	Dingell	Keating
Bishop	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	Elfreth	Kennedy (NY)
Boyle (PA)	Escobar	Khanna
Bresnahan	Españillat	Krishnamoorthi
Brown	Fields	Landsman
Brownley	Figures	Larsen (WA)
Budzinski	Fletcher	Larson (CT)
Bynum	Foster	Latimer
Carbajal	Foushee	Lee (NV)
Carson	Frankel, Lois	Lee (PA)
Carter (LA)	Friedman	Leger Fernandez
Casar	Frost	Levin
Case	Garamendi	Liccardo
Casten	Garcia (CA)	Lieu
Castor (FL)	Garcia (IL)	Lofgren
Castro (TX)	Garcia (TX)	Lynch
Cherfilus-	Gillen	Magaziner
McCormick	Golden (ME)	Mannion
Chu	Goldman (NY)	Matsui
Cisneros	Gomez	McBath
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez, V.	McBride
Clarke (NY)	Goodlander	McClain Delaney
Clyburn	Gottheimer	McClellan
Cohen	Gray	McCollum
Conaway	Green, Al (TX)	McDonald Rivet
Correa	Harder (CA)	McGarvey
Costa	Hayes	McGovern
Courtney	Himes	McIver
Craig	Horsford	Meeks
Crockett	Houlahan	Menendez
Crow	Hoyer	Meng
Cuellar	Hoyle (OR)	Mfume

Min	Ramirez	Suoizzi
Moore (WI)	Randall	Swalwell
Morelle	Raskin	Sykes
Morrison	Riley (NY)	Takano
Moskowitz	Rivas	Thanedar
Moulton	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Mrvan	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Mullin	Ryan	Tlaib
Nadler	Salinas	Tokuda
Neal	Sánchez	Tonko
Neguse	Scanlon	Torres (CA)
Norcross	Schakowsky	Torres (NY)
Nunn (IA)	Schneider	Trahan
Ocasio-Cortez	Scholten	Tran
Olzewski	Schrier	Underwood
Omar	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Pallone	Scott, David	Vasquez
Panetta	Sewell	Veasey
Pappas	Sherman	Velázquez
Pelosi	Simon	Vindman
Perez	Smith (WA)	Walkinshaw
Peters	Sorensen	Wasserman
Pettersen	Soto	Schultz
Pingree	Stansbury	Waters
Pocan	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Pou	Stevens	Whitesides
Pressley	Strickland	Williams (GA)
Quigley	Subramanyam	Wilson (FL)

NAYS—213

Aderholt	Fulcher	McDowell
Alford	Garbarino	McGuire
Allen	Gill (TX)	Meuser
Amodei (NV)	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Arrington	Goldman (TX)	Miller (OH)
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (WV)
Bacon	Gooden	Miller-Meeks
Baird	Gosar	Mills
Balderson	Graves	Moolenaar
Barr	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Barrett	Griffith	Moore (NC)
Baumgartner	Grothman	Moore (UT)
Bean (FL)	Guest	Moore (WV)
Begich	Guthrie	Moran
Bentz	Hageman	Murphy
Bergman	Hamadeh (AZ)	Nehls
Bice	Haridopolos	Norman
Biggs (AZ)	Harrihan	Obernolte
Biggs (SC)	Harris (MD)	Ogles
Billirakis	Harris (NC)	Onder
Boebert	Harshbarger	Owens
Bost	Hern (OK)	Palmer
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Patronis
Buchanan	Hill (AR)	Perry
Burchett	Hinson	Pfluger
Burlison	Hudson	Reschenthaler
Calvert	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Cammack	Hunt	Rogers (KY)
Carey	Hurd (CO)	Rose
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Jack	Roy
Ciscomani	Jackson (TX)	Rulli
Cline	James	Rutherford
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cole	Jordan	Schmidt
Collins	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Crane	Kean	Self
Crank	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Shreve
Crenshaw	Kennedy (UT)	Simpson
Davidson	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
De La Cruz	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Knott	Smucker
Donalds	Kustoff	Spartz
Downing	LaHood	Stauber
Dunn (FL)	LaLota	Stefanik
Edwards	LaMalfa	Steil
Ellzey	Langworthy	Steube
Emmer	Latta	Strong
Estes	Lee (FL)	Stutzman
Evans (CO)	Letlow	Taylor
Ezell	Loudermilk	Tenney
Fallon	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Fedorchak	Luna	Tiffany
Feenstra	Luttrell	Timmons
Fine	Mace	Turner (OH)
Finstad	Mackenzie	Valadao
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Fitzgerald	Maloy	Van Dyne
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Van Orden
Fleischmann	Massie	Wagner
Flood	Mast	Walberg
Fong	McCauley	Weber (TX)
Foxx	McClain	Webster (FL)
Franklin, Scott	McClintock	Westerman
Fry	McCormick	Wied