

Florida Supreme Court Justice James Perry, Anne Piervil, Lisa Williams, the late great State Senator Geraldine Thompson, and the late Eatonville Mayor Eddie Cole.

Today and always, we celebrate their achievements and continue to honor Black excellence, not just Black history, but also the history we are continuing to create.

#### RELIEF FOR EARLY ON-SET ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

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

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my bill, the BRIDGE for Young Onset Alzheimer's Disease Act.

Right now, Americans diagnosed with Alzheimer's after age 65 receive immediate Medicare coverage, but those diagnosed before 65, despite facing the same devastating disease, are forced to wait nearly 29 months for the exact same care.

For the 200,000 Americans living with young-onset Alzheimer's, that delay is devastating.

The BRIDGE for YOAD Act fixes this gap by eliminating the Medicare waiting period for those with young-onset Alzheimer's. Early access to care matters. This disease progresses very quickly. Many patients lose the ability to work or support themselves long before coverage kicks in, while families are left to shoulder an additional \$20,000 a year in out-of-pocket costs.

Congress has acted before for rapidly progressing diseases like ALS. We should do the same here. As one of my constituents put it, this bill puts health and dignity first.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the BRIDGE for YOAD Act.

#### EAST FULLERTON LITTLE LEAGUE 70TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize East Fullerton Little League's 70th birthday.

Little League's mission is to instill in children the values of sportsmanship, honesty, loyalty, and courage, aiming to produce well-adjusted, stronger, and happier children.

The hundreds of volunteers who take the jobs of running a Little League are usually the unsung heroes. That is why I am standing here today to recognize the Little League volunteers who have stepped up to the plate to demonstrate the benefits and values of volunteerism, family, and sportsmanship.

Let's follow the example of our Little League parents and volunteers by making a pledge to support youth in our community and to support the people who spend countless hours teaching America's favorite pastime.

Let's play ball, Mr. Speaker.

□ 0910

#### SANTA CLARITA LADY FLYERS TRAGEDY

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

Mr. WHITESIDES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the heartbreaking and inspiring story of the Santa Clarita Lady Flyers, a 12-under hockey team that plays in my district.

While on the way to the Western Girls Hockey League playoffs, a snowplow collided head-on with one of their team vans, injuring five players and killing Manny Lorenzana.

We remember Manny as a loving dad to Brody, an excellent partner to April, and a talented tattoo artist.

After such a tragic event, the team rallied together and made the decision all on their own to play on for Manny and for their injured teammates. Amazingly, in the face of hardship that came far too early for those so young, the Santa Clarita Flyers ended up taking home the championship after a nail-biting final that ended 1-0 in overtime.

Here is what I want this amazing team and their families to know: The entire Santa Clarita community has their back, and we are deeply proud of them. I can't wait to cheer them all on at the next home game next season.

#### YOUR TAX DOLLARS ARE FUNDING THIS

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

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the American people exactly what their tax dollars are being used for: imprisoning children, even infants.

Last month, DHS agents detained a sick 7-year-old and her parents in an urgent care parking lot while they were trying to get her medical attention.

Then they sent that child to the Nation's largest family detention facility, recently reopened by Trump, a facility where families report there is contaminated food, limited access to clean water, and where there have been confirmed measles cases.

Your tax dollars are funding this.

Last Friday, I traveled to Texas to fight to bring Diana and her family home to Oregon. I am grateful that Diana is home safe in Gresham.

This never should have happened in the first place. It is immoral to jail children. It should enrage every American that their tax dollars are being used to do so.

Congress controls the power of the purse. It is past time to reassert that authority and end this horrific practice. We must draw a bright red line: Taxpayer dollars cannot be used to imprison children. That is the bare minimum.

#### LAW-ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE ACT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1057, I call up the bill (H.R. 2189) to modernize Federal firearms laws to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, 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. NEWHOUSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 1057, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-18 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H. R. 2189

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

#### TITLE I—LAW-ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE

##### SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

*This title may be cited as the "Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act".*

##### SEC. 102. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN LESS-THAN-LETHAL PROJECTILE DEVICES FROM RESTRICTIONS UNDER TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

*Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (3), by inserting "or a less-than-lethal projectile device" before the period; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following:*  
*"(39)(A) The term 'less-than-lethal projectile device' means a device that—*

*"(i) is not designed or intended to expel and may not be readily converted to accept and discharge—*

*"(I) ammunition commonly used in handguns, rifles, or shotguns; or*

*"(II) any other projectile at a velocity exceeding 500 feet per second;*

*"(ii) is designed and intended to be used in a manner that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury; and*

*"(iii) does not accept, and is not able to be readily modified to accept, an ammunition feeding device—*

*"(I) loaded through the inside of a pistol grip;*

*or*

*"(II) commonly used in semiautomatic firearms.*

*"(B) If a person requests that the Attorney General determine whether a device satisfies the definition of 'less-than-lethal projectile device' under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall make the determination not later than 90 days after the date on which the Attorney General receives the device pursuant to the request."*

#### TITLE II—INNOVATE LESS LETHAL TO DE-ESCALATE TAX MODERNIZATION

##### SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

*This title may be cited as the "Innovate Less Lethal to De-Escalate Tax Modernization Act".*

##### SEC. 202. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN LESS-THAN-LETHAL PROJECTILE DEVICES FROM FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION TAX.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e), and*

*(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:*

“(d) LESS-THAN-LETHAL PROJECTILE DEVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 4181 shall not apply to—

“(A) any less-than-lethal projectile device,

“(B) any device contained on the most recent list made available by the Secretary under paragraph (4)(B), and

“(C) any shell or cartridge that meets the requirement of paragraph (2)(B) and is designed for use in a device referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B).

“(2) LESS-THAN-LETHAL PROJECTILE DEVICE.—The term ‘less-than-lethal projectile device’ means a device that—

“(A) is not designed or intended to expel, and may not be readily converted to accept and discharge—

“(i) ammunition commonly used in handguns, rifles, or shotguns, or

“(ii) any other projectile at a velocity exceeding 500 feet per second,

“(B) is designed and intended to be used in a manner that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury, and

“(C) does not accept, and is not able to be readily modified to accept, ammunition feeding devices—

“(i) loaded through the inside of a pistol grip, or

“(ii) commonly used in semiautomatic firearms.

“(3) REQUEST FOR CLASSIFICATION.—Pursuant to a request made by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of a device for a determination as to whether such device satisfies the requirements under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall make such determination not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of such request.

“(4) ANNUAL REVIEW OF NEW AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES.—

“(A) LIST OF LESS-THAN-LETHAL PROJECTILE DEVICES.—The Secretary shall make publicly available a list of devices that the Secretary has determined are described in paragraph (2) and shall update such list annually to take into account new devices.

“(B) LIST OF NON-LETHAL DEVICES THE PROJECTIONS OF WHICH EXCEED 500 FEET PER SECOND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(I) make publicly available a list of devices that the Secretary has determined are not described in paragraph (2) but would be so described if such paragraph were applied without regard to subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof, and

“(II) update such list annually to take into account new devices.

“(ii) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall annually submit a written report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate regarding the annual list of devices described in clause (i), including a copy of such list, a description of the devices that were considered for inclusion on such list, and the reasons for including or excluding such devices from such list.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) REQUESTS FOR DETERMINATIONS.—Section 4182(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall apply to requests received after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that any request under such section which is received during the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be treated for purposes of such section as received as of the close of such period.

**SEC. 203. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN LESS-THAN-LETHAL PROJECTILE DEVICES FROM NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT.**

Section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “an antique fire-

arm or” and inserting “any antique firearm, any less-than-lethal projectile device (as defined in section 4182(d)(2)), any device referred to in section 4182(d)(1)(B), or”.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2189.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act.

This bill will put lifesaving, less-lethal technology in the hands of more law enforcement and public safety officers.

When the Gun Control Act of 1968 was enacted more than 50 years ago, it was not written with the intent to regulate less-lethal projectile devices such as tasers.

Unfortunately, if a taser or other device uses an explosive propellant to discharge the projectile, the ATF classifies it as a firearm. This makes it more difficult for law enforcement and public safety officers to obtain and use these devices.

For starters, many States prohibit public safety officers from using firearms. In at least 12 States, correctional officers are unable to carry firearms in the course of their official duties. Many State laws also prohibit or restrict the use of firearms in schools and hospitals, meaning security officers would be unable to purchase these devices if they are needed.

For police departments, law enforcement officers can be unfairly subjected to higher levels of liability exposure for discharging a firearm than a less-lethal device. This includes my own State of Wisconsin, which includes in its definition of deadly force the discharge of a firearm.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act is both necessary and important. H.R. 2189 makes a small but important change to the Gun Control Act's defini-

tion of a firearm to appropriately define a less-lethal projectile device.

It does so by instituting a five-part test, ensuring only devices that are truly less lethal will pass ATF scrutiny. It also exempts these devices from the firearm excise tax, the simple logic being that police departments and manufacturers should no longer be paying a firearm tax on a device that no longer is classified as a firearm. It was never intended to apply to them in the first place, and it should not apply to them now.

By making these simple changes, we are equipping our law enforcement and public safety officers with the best tools to keep our communities safe and our first responders out of harm's way.

Innovation should be rewarded, not stifled, and this bill does just that. I thank my colleagues—Congressman CORREA, Congressman SCHWEIKERT, Congressman STANTON, and all the others who have been supportive of this—for their leadership on this issue over the last two Congresses.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2189, the so-called Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act.

Law enforcement officers serve a critical role in promoting public safety. That is why we must give them the tools to do their job effectively and safely.

However, contrary to what so many of my colleagues have been told, H.R. 2189 does nothing to help law enforcement officers. In fact, it would put our law enforcement officers and so many others in great danger by giving dangerous people easy access to serious weapons.

By changing the definition of “firearm,” H.R. 2189 would create dangerous new loopholes in the Gun Control Act and National Firearms Act, exempting so-called less-than-lethal weapons from our gun laws, including those that require firearms to be traceable, detectable by security equipment, and not available to prohibited purchasers, like felons, fugitives, and domestic abusers. These exemptions would allow these weapons, which can be deadly, to be sold to anyone, including dangerous people, without having to undergo a background check.

Law enforcement has no need for this exemption. They are already exempt from many gun laws and already use all kinds of weapons, including those covered by this bill without any legal obstacles. In fact, police departments in all 50 States already use these tasers. We also know that State and local corrections officers are armed with tasers within prisons and jails across the country.

□ 0920

Let's be clear: This bill is designed to increase civilian purchases of these weapons, and we know this because it

includes an exemption from the NFA excise tax, which law enforcement already does not pay.

More than 3 years ago, prosecutors and legal experts at the Department of Justice sounded the alarm when they reviewed a prior version of this bill. These experts all agree that:

This bill would endanger our officers and communities by weakening their efforts to keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous persons.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives warned that: These weapons could be used against law enforcement, security personnel, or the public, creating an increased risk of harm to public safety. They also would not be traceable if used in a crime.

If this bill were truly about helping law enforcement, Republicans would have taken this feedback from the DOJ and the ATF and revised this bill, but they didn't. The bill before us today poses the same risk to public safety.

Many of my colleagues share my commitment to making sure law enforcement has all the tools that they need to keep themselves and our communities safe. Some of them cosponsored this legislation because they initially believed this bill was a genuine effort to do that. They have since learned the truth. Some joined Congressman THOMPSON's amendment, which would ensure that less-than-lethal weapons are not considered firearms only when they are used by law enforcement officers acting in their official capacity, addressing the alleged purpose of this legislation without creating a dangerous loophole. Republicans rejected that amendment.

Now that these Members, who once cosponsored this bill, see that this bill does not help law enforcement and will, in fact, endanger police and many others, they are now opposing this bill.

We must continue providing the resources and support that strengthen officer and community safety, not undermine them by removing the safeguards that keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous and violent criminals. We need to be preventing violence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind Members that the bill itself has a ton of support, to include the Fraternal Order of Police, Major County Sheriffs, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, NOBLE, Hispanic American Police Command Officers and their associations, Peace Officers Research Association of California, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

Again, I think there is a ton of support out there, and there is actually a real need and a number of requests for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr.

CORREA), my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will save lives. It is supported, as my colleague has said, by an unprecedented, historic coalition. Support spans 95 bipartisan cosponsors across 35 States, including the Fraternal Order of Police, Major County Sheriffs, Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association, Peace Officers Research Association of California, African American Mayors Association, Moms Against Police Brutality, and the Prince Jones, Jr. Foundation.

This collaboration, this coalition of law enforcement leaders and community justice advocates, doesn't happen by accident. It is because this legislation is sound policy, balanced, and needed.

Modern less-than-lethal devices like the latest taser systems fully integrate with body-worn cameras, automatically capturing events and improving oversight.

These tools reduce the risk and increase transparency, expanding the evidence record around use-of-force incidents. It provides clarity for agencies, manufacturers, and regulators without—let me repeat, without—weakening gun laws.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this measure.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act, a very disingenuous title for a bill that doesn't mention law enforcement through the text of the bill.

This bill does weaken gun laws in this country. This bill will lead to more ghost guns across this country. I promise you that within weeks of this being passed, files will be online for people to be able to 3D print just the few parts that will be needed to transform a taser that uses gun powder to a gun that is going to be able to shoot bullets. Then, within months, people would be able to purchase the same parts online or in their local gun store.

The sponsor of this bill says that it makes it possible for law enforcement to obtain tasers. They don't need this bill to do that. In fact, this bill isn't even tailored specifically to law enforcement. It changes gun laws in this country.

Law enforcement uses tasers in all 50 States. Gun violence is already the leading cause of death for children in our country. This Congress does not need to be in the business of weakening the laws that we do have, but we do need to be in the business of doing what we need to do to end gun violence in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind Members, again, that a lot of the accusations that this will create other avenues for individuals to get firearms is just not true. To be classified as a less-than-lethal device under this bill, the device may not accept firearm ammunition. I don't know how much clearer that can be.

There are no firearm magazines involved with these weapons at all, and they do not have high-velocity projectiles.

There are a lot of scare tactics being used to try to paint this as if it is being extended to other firearms. It is not.

This would also prevent these ideas from taking hold amongst discussions about ghost guns, which is something that is out there on the street. For any weapon that also has kits that can be converted to a firearm, it doesn't apply to them.

This bill also requires ATF to deny classification to any device that could be readily modified into a firearm.

I know there is a lot of hearsay, a lot of thoughts about where this could go in the future, but, quite honestly, that is not the way this bill was drafted. It is not going to lend itself to being used that way.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia for her extraordinary leadership for gun safety and public safety in America.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would rip a dangerous new loophole in the Gun Control Act by changing the definition of firearm throughout the entire criminal code to exclude from coverage certain less-than-lethal but still highly dangerous weapons, such as tasers, which have been identified as a contributing factor in more than 500 deaths throughout the United States of America.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, this bill would exempt these weapons, which are currently classified as firearms, from all regulations under all Federal firearm laws. These weapons would be exempted from the laws, regardless of who uses, purchases, possesses, or manufactures them.

Mr. Speaker, 20 million people who are presently not allowed to possess or buy firearms in this country—convicted domestic abusers, convicted felons in every State, fugitives, and other prohibited purchasers—would legally be able to buy these dangerous weapons, like tasers, that are designed to incapacitate their targets.

A convicted domestic felon, who has been deprived of his right to have firearms because he has been proven to be

a danger to people in his family, in his home, his wife, his girlfriend, would be able to go out and get a taser. They would be able to go and get that taser without going through a single background check. They would just be able to go get it.

The bill exempts these weapons from the requirement that they have a serial number and that they be traceable so that law enforcement can identify their owners if they are used in violent crimes.

It would also exempt them from the Undetectable Firearms Act, which requires that firearms be detectable by metal detectors and X-ray machines used at airports. This detection element is key to preventing weapons from getting where they shouldn't be and preventing serious crimes.

If the bill becomes law, nothing would stop a convicted felon or a convicted domestic violence abuser from purchasing an undetectable taser and smuggling that weapon past security, onto an airplane, into a school area, indeed, into the Capitol, unbeknownst to anyone before it is too late. The bill would make everybody less safe.

Supporters say it is needed so law enforcement can use these less-than-lethal weapons. Mr. Speaker, 18,000 law enforcement agencies are already exempt from many of the provisions in this act and are already using taser technologies. Everybody knows that police have access to tasers. Police departments in all 50 States are using tasers today.

Likewise, the tax exemption in this bill does nothing for law enforcement agencies either because they already purchase these weapons completely free of the excise tax.

The combination of these exemptions is no accident. They do nothing for law enforcement. They both provide unfettered, even tax-free, access to dangerous weapons to civilians, including at least 20 million who shouldn't have them and wouldn't have them under current law.

Supporters argue the change is needed because the classification of these weapons as firearms may result in the use of the weapon being considered deadly force, even though the device is designed to be less than lethal.

We have been asking for years, and they cannot provide us a single case where this problem exists. In fact, courts have readily distinguished between deadly force and intermediate force in cases involving law enforcement.

They don't have a single case. They just say that some State attorney somewhere heard from another lawyer they were nervous about it. Mr. Speaker, come on. That is not how we should be legislating in the Congress of the United States.

Congressman MIKE THOMPSON and 18 of our colleagues submitted an amendment to ensure that less-than-lethal weapons are not considered firearms only when they are used by law en-

forcement in their official capacity, which is purportedly what this is about. They rejected it.

The Republicans didn't want to hear it because we know that, in fact, there is a commercial purpose that pervades this entire legislation. It is all about opening up a huge, new market to sell tasers, including to millions of people who nobody should want to have them.

I have repeatedly supported and will continue to support legislation to give law enforcement every tool and training they need to keep us safe. I have got to oppose this legislation that could put law enforcement officers and the rest of us in danger.

I stand with the huge number of gun safety groups working to combat gun violence and domestic violence and who strongly oppose and condemn this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in opposing H.R. 2189.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the ranking member that all U.S. States and territories already criminalize misuse of less-than-lethal devices through existing assault and battery laws.

Mr. Speaker, 42 States have explicit statutory definitions for less-than-lethal devices. Of those 42 States, 34 already prohibit possession by violent felons and domestic abusers, they impose age restrictions, and impose criminal penalties for misuse. Several States even require permits, licenses, or a background check to purchase or possess these devices.

This is not something that the State legislatures aren't aware of. As a matter of fact, I have said before, I think that there may be some State legislatures that will react to the legislation before us today and possibly come up with other items that States have already put in place that probably will support law enforcement in this area.

I think suggestions that the bill will put these devices in the hands of violent felons or the general public are blown way out of proportion and that H.R. 2189 preserves State regulations on these devices. It does not weaken existing safeguards against misuse.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because it would make us less safe. Police already have access to less-than-lethal weapons like tasers. They don't need a change in the law. That is not an excuse for changing the law.

This bill expands access to dangerous, prohibited individuals by stripping away Federal safeguards. Tasers may not shoot bullets, but they are still dangerous in the wrong hands.

This bill would mean that anyone can buy them without a background

check including people convicted of serious violent crimes and domestic abusers with restraining orders against them.

This bill would also eliminate serialization, making these dangerous devices untraceable. H.R. 2189 is a reckless expansion of the gun industry.

Mr. Speaker, because we all care about public safety, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and my colleagues in opposition to this dangerous piece of legislation.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, when I first heard about this bill, I thought it was very interesting that my Republican colleagues had this newfound conviction in helping to prevent law enforcement doing bad things to people and working to de-escalate law enforcement.

I am someone who has been a victim of the abuse of law enforcement, and I just haven't heard my colleagues ever talk about it. I came at this bill skeptically when I looked at it. It turns out the bill itself was pretty much written by a corporation, Axon, that wants to sell a new type of taser.

Let's be clear with everyone. Anyone can buy a taser right now. I would ask everyone watching to go online and look at the fact that anyone can buy it. It can be purchased on Amazon. Anyone can buy a taser right now.

This has to do with new technology that uses gunpowder. This is the reason the ATF decided to regulate this years ago. This doesn't have to do with de-escalating law enforcement, which has tasers in all 50 States. This has to do with selling more weapons and firearms, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I will just remind the Members we have 22 Democrat cosponsors on this bill. I am sure that those Members are hearing from their own local law enforcement. I am sure they are hearing from their chiefs of police. I am sure they are hearing from their sheriffs.

I am sure that they are hearing from some private security firms that want to be able to access this technology that has been there for some time and has been proven to be a de-escalator in these very tense situations that law enforcement officers find themselves in.

Mr. Speaker, I will say Wisconsin, my State, defines deadly force in its use-of-force policy as: The intentional use of a firearm or other instrument that creates a high probability of death or great bodily harm.

□ 0940

That is what we are trying to overcome, is this definition that does not fit this new technology.

Wisconsin already regulates the use of tasers and stun guns at the State level. You must be over 18 to own a stun gun or a taser, and you must be 21 and possess a valid concealed carry permit to carry in the public.

This is not going to be unchecked. There are absolutely going to be legislatures that will revisit this. It is currently a felony to carry a stun gun or a taser in public without a valid permit. It is illegal to possess stun guns or tasers for those who had prior felony convictions.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of this has already been thought out. It is law enforcement members who think about these items each and every day. It is those in leadership positions who think about these items, and we are responding to that. That is simply what we are doing here.

Once again, I think it is a great bill. I hope that Members support it. It sounds like it is going to be what I would expect to be a solid, bipartisan vote today.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2189.

Let's get honest about what this bill does and doesn't do. It does not require training. It does not set standards. It does not improve accountability, and it does not apply only to law enforcement.

It does carve out a sweeping exemption in our Federal firearms laws and makes it easier for dangerous people to access dangerous weapons with fewer safeguards.

Supporters keep saying that this bill is about helping law enforcement, but if that were true, the bill would mention law enforcement. It doesn't. Law enforcement agencies already have the ability to procure less-lethal tools and are already exempt from many Federal firearm requirements.

Let's talk about who opposes this bill. It is opposed by Brady, Everytown for Gun Safety, GIFFORDS, Newtown Action Alliance, Sandy Hook Promise Action Fund, Jewish Women International, Catholics for Family Peace Education and Research Initiative, Illinois Accountability Initiative, Just Solutions, Legal Momentum, and the National Domestic Violence Hotline.

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

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2189 does nothing to help law enforcement, who already uses these weapons in all 50 States. It does not provide any new tools or training that would reduce police shootings or promote the safety of officers or the public.

Instead, it makes dangerous weapons widely available to everyone, including those who should not have them. It allows those weapons to be untraceable, undetectable by equipment, and sold to anyone without a background check.

This bill is especially dangerous for those experiencing domestic violence since this bill provides easy, legal access to weapons that are designed to control and incapacitate their target and can be deadly. Groups that combat domestic violence and gun violence and who support public safety all oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters from various organizations opposing this bill.

FEBRUARY 5, 2026.

Hon. JOHN THUNE,  
*Senate Majority Leader,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,*  
*DC.*

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,  
*Senate Minority Leader,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
*Democratic Leader,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

TO MAJORITY LEADER THUNE, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER JOHNSON, AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We write to express our strong opposition to H.R. 2189/S. 1283, the Law Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act and H.R. 4242, the Innovate Less Lethal to De-Escalate Tax Modernization Act. While the stated intent of these pieces of legislation is to promote the use of "new less-than-lethal technologies, such as long-range tasers" by law enforcement in lieu of traditional firearms, they do not reference law enforcement at all, and are unnecessary, reckless, and would have far broader implications for public safety. These bills would create a loophole for firearm access by prohibited individuals by effectively creating a new legal market for untraceable weapons. Additionally, they will upend the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' (ATF) enforcement of firearm laws, allow for the development and sale of weapons that are properly prohibited by law, and make "less-than-lethal" devices that employ explosive propellant available to the public, including individuals convicted of serious violent crimes, without any federal regulation. Furthermore, while both bills present their own independent public safety concerns, in tandem, there are effectively no limits to what kinds of "less-than-lethal" weapon systems the gun industry may develop. Even more troubling, the legislation contains no prohibition or limitations on modifications that could turn these devices into lethal weapons. While we applaud bipartisan efforts to decrease the risk of lethality in law enforcement encounters and commend Congress' commitment to encourage de-escalation tactics, we oppose H.R. 2189/S. 1283 and H.R. 4242 as written and urge members of Congress to oppose these bills in their current form.

#### UNNECESSARY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

The sponsors of these pieces of legislation contend that their purpose is to increase access to and limit liability for law enforcement use of certain less-than-lethal devices, including specific types of TASERS, which are classified as firearms because they use explosive propellant as opposed to compressed gas. The text of these bills does not mention law enforcement, either directly or by virtue of statutory changes, in any capacity. Thus, the changes to the federal code included in these bills will apply equally to all persons, including individuals convicted of serious violent crimes.

Federal law enforcement entities, such as ICE and CBP, already widely employ such devices, and have entered into procurement contracts worth over \$35 million for Taser systems in just the last few years, including at least \$15 million for the Taser 10 weapons system, a firearm-classified less-than-lethal device.

Furthermore, state and local governments, along with their accompanying law enforcement agencies, already procure and deploy vast numbers of firearms, including less-than-lethal devices classified as firearms. In fact, many of the civilian requirements for firearms purchases are waived for agencies and even individual officers purchasing weapons for service, including background checks and prohibitions on purchasing firearms across state lines. Such purchases are even exempted from federal excise taxes on firearms and ammunition. Thus, there is no federal constraint on law enforcement's procurement of TASERS or other less-than-lethal devices that are classified as firearms.

Proponents of these bills suggest that state and local law enforcement are restrained from deploying firearm-classified less-than-lethal devices, including TASERS that fall under the definition of firearm, because of concerns about liability, specifically that their use would inherently constitute "deadly force" because of their firearm classification. However, if such constraints exist at all, they are a function of state or local laws. In fact, federal regulations and courts have held that the use of less-than-lethal devices, even those classified as firearms, does not constitute deadly force on its own. Furthermore, deregulating such devices under federal law would not absolve most law enforcement agencies from such liability, as nearly every single state has a statutory definition of firearm that is functionally equal to that contained in U.S. code. Therefore, removing these less-than-lethal devices from the federal definition of "firearm" would not resolve this issue.

In fact, law enforcement agencies are already utilizing firearm-classified less-than-lethal devices in every state at every level: states, counties, towns, villages, townships, and even correctional facilities have already deployed them and many more are moving to adopt them. Moreover, even in states with use of force policies that stipulate that the use of a firearm constitutes deadly force, local department use of force policies specifically enumerate that the Taser 10, a firearm-classified device, constitutes "non-lethal force."

#### THE LAW ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE ACT (H.R. 2189/S. 1283)

At its core, H.R. 2189/S. 1283 would deregulate "less-than-lethal projectile devices" currently classified as firearms under federal law and, therefore, subject to important and long-standing public safety protections. In doing so, these high-powered "less-than-lethal" devices would become available to the general public and prohibited persons alike without these protections all because this legislation would no longer treat them as

“firearms.” In addition, because H.R. 2189/S. 1283 do not prohibit modification, there is nothing to prohibit a convicted felon, domestic abuser, or anyone else for that matter, in possession of such a “less-than-lethal” device from turning it into a fully lethal weapon. At the same time, this legislation would provide the firearms industry with a roadmap to innovate “less-than-lethal” weapons that, but-for H.R. 2189/S. 1283 would be considered “firearms,” to make an end-run around existing federal law, which would effectively establish a new, legal ghost gun market. H.R. 2189/S. 1283 radically alters the definition of “firearm” under the Gun Control Act of 1968 (GCA).

Under the GCA, a “firearm” includes “any weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive,” as well as “the frame or receiver of any such weapon,” which houses the critical fire control components and is the only part of a firearm that is regulated under federal law on its own.

H.R. 2189/S. 1283 changes this definition to create a new class of weapons, “less-than-lethal projectile devices,” that are exempted from all federal regulation under the GCA and would no longer require serialization of their frames or receivers, background checks when they are transferred, or paperwork for their manufacture, distribution, or sale.

Exempting these devices from basic public safety requirements creates a dangerous loophole for prohibited persons—such as individuals with felony or domestic violence convictions—to access deadly weapons, creating a new legal market for untraceable weapons. While H.R. 2189/S. 1283 does stipulate that devices would need to be designed and intended to be used in a manner not likely to cause death or serious bodily harm, and that they may not be readily convertible to fire ammunition commonly used in most other firearms, the bill neither prohibits nor penalizes the modification of these devices for such purposes, effectively deregulating firearm access even for prohibited individuals.

Given the long history of modifying weapons to make them even more dangerous, it is not hard to imagine scenarios where unscrupulous gun industry actors would seize on this dangerous definitional change to produce their own “less-than-lethal projectile devices” that could later be more easily modified to be fully lethal. For the last decade, the gun industry used ambiguity in the existing regulation of firearms to create a market for unfinished frames and receivers, as well as kits to finish assembling them, which were the basis for the ghost gun market before the ATF promulgated a rule to regulate them as firearms. Aside from frames or receivers, all other firearm components are entirely unregulated under federal law, making it inevitable that kits and parts to modify these “less-than-lethal projectile devices” will become commercially available, and schematics for 3D-printed conversion components will also become available online.

More importantly, a change in the definition of “firearm” may upend all ATF enforcement of the law with regard to firearms. The Supreme Court recently ruled in *VanDerStok* that ATF’s regulation entitled “Definition of ‘Frame or Receiver’ and Identification of Firearms” was properly conceived and implemented—that “the GCA embraces, and thus permits ATF to regulate, some weapon parts kits and unfinished frames or receivers. Changing the definition of ‘firearm’ such that an entire class of weapons (and their attending frames and receivers) are no longer ‘firearms’ would create new opportunities for the industry to challenge and evade firearm regulations. The

Supreme Court’s recent case law in *VanDerStok* and *Cargill*, where the court ruled that bump stocks did not satisfy the definition of “machinegun,” shows the importance of carefully crafted, thorough definitions in firearms statutes.

While the legislation says that the device cannot be “designed and intended and may not be readily converted to accept and discharge . . . projectile[s] at a velocity exceeding 500 feet per second,” it ignores the fact that such devices, as with all firearms, do not by themselves determine the velocity of the projectiles they fire, but it is the ammunition which is the determinant of velocity.

Further, while the bill prohibits manufactured devices from being able to accept ammunition “commonly used in handguns, rifles, and shotguns,” the frame or receiver of a firearm often does not determine the type of ammunition that it can fire on its own. Often, it is the other, unregulated components of the firearm that determine that factor.

#### THE INNOVATE LESS LETHAL TO DE-ESCALATE TAX MODERNIZATION ACT (H.R. 4242)

This bill would create dangerous exemptions to the definition of “firearm” under the National Firearms Act (NFA). The National Firearms Act covers certain firearms and accessories determined by Congress almost a century ago to be particularly dangerous. In turn, Congress imposed strict regulations on the manufacture and sale of these weapons and accessories, requiring approval from ATF after a background check, the submission of fingerprints and a photograph, registration of the weapon, as well as a tax stamp. The weapons covered by the NFA are very limited in scope, including machine guns, destructive devices such as grenade launchers and large-bore rifles and shotguns (greater than .50 caliber), and firearms that fall under the category of “any other weapon” such as firearms incorporated into other common objects or disguised to be undetectable as firearms, i.e., umbrella or flashlight guns.

This bill would remove NFA registration requirements and deregulate the private transfer of certain devices that would otherwise be classified as firearms under the NFA. This includes destructive devices, including devices that would otherwise be classified as grenade launchers, large-bore (greater than .50 caliber) weapons, kinetic impact devices, and immobility devices classified as “any other weapon,” including bola devices, so long as they fell under the definition of a “less than lethal projectile device”—a definition which is both alarmingly easy to satisfy and of which certain elements can be waived at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. While law enforcement agencies have access to such devices, these bills would establish broad unregulated civilian access, even for those with prohibiting criminal convictions.

#### AUTOMATED AND UNDETECTABLE WEAPONS SYSTEMS

While both H.R. 2189/S. 1283 and H.R. 4242 present their own independent public safety concerns; in tandem, there are effectively very few limits to what kinds of “less-than-lethal” weapon systems the gun industry may develop after their enactment—which could be sold directly to the public without regulation.

Alarmingly, as these devices would no longer qualify as “firearms” under any federal statute, they would no longer be subject to the Undetectable Firearms Act (UFA), recently reauthorized with overwhelming bipartisan and law enforcement support, paving the way for the incorporation of firearm technology into “less-than-lethal” area denial devices, robotics, and even armed

drones. While some of these weapon systems already exist—such as the TASER Shockwave, effectively a TASER claymore that can shoot dozens, or even hundreds, of projectiles at the same time for crowd control—they rely on compressed gas, making them large and cumbersome to deploy. The incorporation of explosive propellant would create opportunities to miniaturize these systems and deploy them using automated or remote systems.

Finally, these bills would completely undermine the UFA, making it legal to incorporate firearm technology into devices that are specifically designed to evade all standard security measures, such as metal detectors and X-ray machines, all available for unregulated civilian use.

#### CONCLUSION

Deregulating these “less-than-lethal” devices will put lives at risk, especially the most vulnerable in society. Because these devices would no longer fall under the legal definition of “firearm,” they would be available to all members of the public without a background check and without a prohibition on modification. Even with those safeguards, these bills could open a brand new market for dangerous weapons that are obtainable by anyone, including prohibited persons. Despite the stated intent, these bills are not designed to benefit law enforcement and will instead place them at risk as they encounter these weapons more frequently on the streets. As such, we oppose H.R. 2189/S. 1283 and H.R. 4242 and urge members of Congress not to support them.

Sincerely,

BRADY,  
COMMUNITY JUSTICE  
ACTION FUND.  
EVERYTOWN FOR GUN  
SAFETY.  
GIFFORDS.  
NEWTOWN ACTION AL-  
LIANCE.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. JAMIE RASKIN,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN JORDAN AND RANKING MEMBER RASKIN: On behalf of Sandy Hook Promise, a national nonprofit committed to preventing violence and other acts that harm children, we write to share our opposition to H.R. 2189 and S. 1283, the Law Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act. This legislation has the potential to deregulate certain TASERS and other less-than-lethal devices currently classified as firearms. While we appreciate Congressional efforts to decrease the potential for lethality during interactions with law enforcement, especially for children, the legislation could create expanded harm to young people and does not increase access to less than lethal technology for law enforcement in a meaningful way.

The Law Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act could also lead to a widespread increase in the availability of less-than-lethal devices, including TASERS, for general-public use. While these devices can cause serious bodily harm when used on adults, they pose an even greater risk to children. Even manufacturers of these devices acknowledge that deploying them on young people increases the risk of death or severe injury. It is therefore dangerous to expand access to these devices before creating strong guardrails to ensure they are not deployed against children.

Sandy Hook Promise applauds Congress for working on bipartisan legislation to reduce the use of lethal force, and we are eager to

work with you if this bill advances out of Committee. We encourage Congress to pursue avenues such as conducting hearings or requesting a study from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide clear guidance around the use of force against youth. We are happy to meet any time with your offices on this issue.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH MURPHY,  
Senior Vice President of Policy and  
Partnerships,  
Sandy Hook Promise Action Fund.

FEBRUARY 9, 2026.

Speaker MIKE JOHNSON,  
House of Representatives.  
Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
House of Representatives.

TO SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: In 2014, a Washington, DC resident (name withheld to protect the victim's privacy) abused his wife with a TASER, repeatedly shocking her in the face and head. While she was still suffering the effects of the TASER, he repeatedly hit her in the head with a baseball bat, punched her multiple times in the face, and then sexually assaulted her. In 2018, a New Jersey man threatened his girlfriend repeatedly with a TASER in the course of raping her several times over multiple incidents. Eventually, he carried through with his threat, tasing her in the neck and raping and sodomizing her.

These incidents are both horrific and emblematic of a larger issue: domestic abusers' use of weapons to exert power and coercive control over their victims. Abusers threaten the victim, the children, pets, and others. As a nation, we should erect more barriers to domestic abusers acquiring weapons, not demolish existing protections. But that is exactly what H.R. 2189/S. 1283 would do by undermining laws designed to keep so-called "less-than-lethal projectile devices," such as TASERS classified as firearms, and ghost guns out of the hands of adjudicated abusers.

To be clear, despite their marketing, TASERS are not always "less-than-lethal," as claimed in H.R. 2189. Perhaps they are less lethal than other firearms, but between 2012 and 2021, 538 people were killed by TASERS or stun guns. And studies that have found TASERS have only minor health impacts were not only primarily funded by the manufacturer, they did not mimic real-life situations, having exclusively healthy subjects, a short exposure time, and no long-term follow-up. Moreover, domestic violence continues or for some populations even escalates during pregnancy, and there is evidence that the use of a TASER on a pregnant woman can cause her to miscarry.

Under current federal law, adjudicated domestic abusers (with a few notable exceptions) are prohibited from possessing TASERS that are classified as firearms in addition to ghost guns and traditional firearms. Removing such TASERS and other "less-than-lethal projectile devices" modified to be lethal from the definition of a "firearm" in 18 USC 921(a) will not only allow adjudicated domestic abusers to acquire projectile weapons without a background check, it will make it perfectly legal for a domestic abuser—and other people convicted of violent and abhorrent crimes such as felony child molestation—to possess these weapons. While that might not be the intent of the bill authors, that will be the real-life impact.

H.R. 2189/S. 1283 will have another chilling unintended consequence: domestic abusers and others who are prohibited under federal law from possessing firearms will modify "less-than-lethal projectile devices" to circumvent federal laws and regulations, in-

cluding those regulating so-called 'ghost guns.' In 2022, an adjudicated domestic abuser who was prohibited from possessing firearms used a ghost gun to murder his three daughters in a Sacramento church during a supervised visitation then murdered the chaperone and killed himself. Unable to pass a background check, he assembled his own firearm from untraceable gun parts which were unregulated at the time. Since that incident, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives issued a regulation, upheld by the United States Supreme Court in *Bondi v. Vanderstock*, to require background checks and serial numbers on unfinished frames and receivers and on some weapons parts kits. But only firearms frames and receivers are thus regulated; removing "less-than-lethal projectile devices" from the definition of 'firearm' in 18 USC 921(a) would also allow ghost guns modified from such devices to proliferate among individuals with criminal records. And since only firearms frames and receivers are regulated, kits to modify such devices into fully-lethal projectile weapons would be entirely legal and unregulated. Plus, while the bill stipulates that "less-than-lethal projectile devices . . . must be designed and intended to be used in a manner that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury," the bill fails to prohibit or even acknowledge the inevitable modification of "less-than-lethal projectile devices" into entirely-lethal projectile devices. Once again, adjudicated domestic abusers who are prohibited from possessing firearms under federal law would be legally permitted to possess a firearm-equivalent, with the same lethal capacity, due simply to semantics.

So, now, let us return to the depraved domestic and sexual violence offenders whose heinous acts were detailed in the opening paragraph. Despite their use of TASERS to physically and sexually abuse their intimate partners and the attendant criminal convictions that would prohibit them from possessing firearms, immediately upon their release from prison these individuals would legally be permitted under federal law to acquire TASERS and other high-powered "less-than-lethal projectile devices" that today are classified as firearms. Moreover, once they obtained such weapons, there would be no barrier in federal law to obtain the necessary parts to modify them into lethal projectile weapons.

The purpose of this bill is truly perplexing. Not only will H.R. 2189/S. 1283 arm adjudicated domestic abusers and others who pose a danger to public safety, it in no way achieves its stated goals and is a solution in search of a problem. The federal classification of TASERS as firearms in no way precludes law enforcement agencies from accessing TASERS, just as it does not preclude them from accessing an array of any of the "less-than-lethal" devices currently classified as firearms. Law enforcement agencies are easily able to procure firearms, including "less-than-lethal projective devices" currently classified as firearms, with many civilian requirements for purchasing firearms—and federal taxes—being waived. And contrary to a further argument in support of H.R. 2189/S. 1283, removing "less-than-lethal projectile devices" from the federal definition of a 'firearm' will not decrease law enforcement's liability for the use of deadly force. In terms of federal law, both regulations and courts have held that, on its own, the use of TASERS and other "less-than-lethal projectile devices" does not constitute deadly force. Moreover, even if that were not the case, changing the federal definition of a firearm to exclude TASERS and similar devices would in no way impact liability for using deadly force, because such liability

outside the context of federal law enforcement is established in state and local law, which H.R. 2189/S. 1283 cannot alter.

So what, then, is the purpose of H.R. 2189/S. 1283? Perhaps it is to exempt individuals attempting to acquire TASERS and similar devices from undergoing a background check. In that case, the benefits to public safety are unclear, while we have amply demonstrated the risks. Perhaps an individual seeks to acquire such a device for self-protection. If the individual does not have a prohibiting record, they should be able to pass a firearms background check with no inconvenience to themselves—most firearms background checks take only a few minutes to complete. And if they do have a prohibiting record, for the safety not only of victims and survivors of domestic violence but for public safety more broadly, they should not have access to either a "less-than-lethal" device or a fully-lethal firearm.

For all of these reasons, we oppose H.R. 2189/S. 1283, and we urge you to oppose it as well.

Sincerely,

Jewish Women International; Catholics for Family Peace Education and Research Initiative; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Hope Rise Thrive; Interfaith Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence; Legal Momentum; The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; Nuns Against Gun Violence; Safe Havens Interfaith Partnership Against Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas Justice Team; Ujima: The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community; United Church of Christ.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, Democrats will continue to support law enforcement innovation and the adoption of tools that keep everyone safer, but we must oppose this misguided legislation that does not promote innovation or de-escalation and will only put our law enforcement, those experiencing domestic abuse, and others in danger.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the CBO score for this bill.

H.R. 2189, LAW-ENFORCEMENT INNOVATE TO DE-ESCALATE ACT, AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON JANUARY 30, 2026

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2026	2026–2030	2026–2035
Direct Spending (Outlays) .....	*	*	*
Revenues .....	*	*	*
Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit .....	*	*	*
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays) .....	*	*	**

\* = between – \$500,000 and \$500,000.  
\*\* = not estimated.

Increases net direct spending in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036? No.

Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036? \*

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? Yes.

Mandate Effects:  
Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.  
Contains private-sector mandate? No.

H.R. 2189 would amend the definition of firearm in the Gun Control Act of 1968 to exclude certain nonlethal projectile devices. Under current law, people who violate this Act could be subject to criminal penalties. Criminal penalties are recorded in the budget as revenues, deposited into the Crime Victims Fund, and later spent without further appropriation. Because CBO expects that the number of affected cases would be small, we estimate that any decrease in revenues and direct spending would be insignificant over the 2026–2035 period.

CBO estimates that any administrative costs for the Department of Justice to implement H.R. 2189 would be insignificant. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Sean Christensen. The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,  
Director, Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will spend the time I have remaining responding to a few points made by my colleagues.

First of all, the U.S. States and territories already criminalize the misuse of less-lethal devices through existing assault and battery laws, and 34 States also restrict possession by violent felons and domestic abusers.

Let me repeat that. It is illegal for violent felons and domestic abusers to own or misuse less-lethal devices.

Mr. Speaker, our bill does not change that. H.R. 2189 preserves State regulation and, in fact, may invite State legislatures to adjust their statutes to harmonize with Federal law.

Second, the bill will not create ghost guns or other unregulated firearms. The five-part test in this bill would sufficiently protect against deregulation, and any product submitted to ATF for classification will be scrutinized under the ATF's existing classification process.

There is no loophole. This fear-mongering by colleagues on the other side of the aisle this morning is nothing more than that.

Finally, police do, in fact, have difficulty obtaining these devices. State and local police departments in States like California, New York, and Texas will not buy the newest taser models due to the increased liability.

This is not some hypothetical. Unless we make this change, State and local police departments will have to settle for weaker, less-accurate taser models due to this misclassification.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the Committee on the Judiciary has expired.

The Chair now recognizes from the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), for 15 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri is now recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2189, which includes the Innovate Less Lethal to De-Escalate Tax Modernization Act, led by Congressman DAVID SCHWEIKERT.

This legislation shines a bright light on how our laws actually work in the real world, where outdated policy can get in the way of safer outcomes. At the end of the day, this is about encouraging tools that help de-escalate conflict and reduce the chances of serious injury or loss of life.

Across the country, law enforcement officers are asked to resolve dangerous situations every day with the least amount of harm as possible. Less-than-lethal devices, like tasers and similar technologies, exist for that exact purpose.

Right now, some of these tools are treated in the tax code like traditional firearms. That means that they can face extra taxes and regulatory burdens that were never designed with such tools in mind. The result is higher costs, more red tape, and slower adoption of technology that can actually make encounters safer for both officers and civilians.

This bill fixes that mismatch. It makes clear that less-than-lethal weapons, such as tasers, should not be taxed like firearms. It gives clarity to manufacturers; certainty to regulators; and, ultimately, better access to life-saving tools for law enforcement and the communities that they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCHWEIKERT for his incredible leadership on this bill that keeps our laws on pace with real-world solutions that reduce harm and protect our communities.

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

□ 0950

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, H.R. 2189, the taser bill. I would note that the bill doesn't mention tasers anywhere in the bill, other than in the title.

I am a supporter of innovation. I am a supporter of de-escalation. I am a supporter of tasers. My son is a deputy sheriff. I support giving him and all law enforcement every tool needed to keep them and the people they serve safe, but let me be clear: This bill does nothing to help law enforcement access tasers. The fact is, this bill recklessly and needlessly weakens both the National Firearms Act and the Gun Control Act.

Under current law, tasers are not regulated by the National Firearms Act. That is the law that regulates especially dangerous devices like machine guns and sawed-off shotguns.

Under current law, law enforcement in their official capacity are not subject to the background check requirement in the Gun Control Act. That is the law that prevents felons and domestic abusers from buying weapons.

Under the current law, contrary to what the chairman just mentioned, law enforcement is not subject to the excise tax for firearms or for tasers.

Instead of helping law enforcement access tasers, this bill weakens the law that regulates machine guns and opens the door to another flood of unregulated, deadly ghost guns in our community. I don't know one person in law enforcement who wants more untraceable ghost guns on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, it is unclear what barriers law enforcement faces in using long-range tasers. I have never received a complaint from law enforcement in my district, nor have I seen any reports suggesting that this is a problem. Long-range tasers are already used by law enforcement—and listen to this—in all 50 States, and in all 50 States, law enforcement pays zero excise taxes on these devices. It is important to know that long-range tasers can already be legally purchased by civilians. All they need to do is pass a background check.

I support tasers. I support law enforcement. This bill does not mention tasers once, and law enforcement is only mentioned in the title. I don't know what they are trying to do, but it looks to me like this might just be the proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, have you ever had a piece of legislation—we all go through this—where you have your friends on the opposite side who say things, and you think, wow, I can't find that in this piece of legislation. I guess we are all sometimes in the pandering business.

About a year ago, in my community, we had a woman who came running out of her house holding a knife. She was having some sort of horrible mental health issue, and she was charging a police officer with a knife. Before this type of technology, she would have lost her life because a traditional firearm would have been used. They used a non-lethal.

The reason it doesn't say "taser" in the language is because who knows what next year's innovation is going to be. That is the whole point: Can you have a society where, through the use of technology, people don't die?

Why do the bill? Why do this portion of the bill for those of us on the Committee on Ways and Means? Let's go back about 100 years ago. On excise tax, you have 11 percent on the cartridge, and you have 10 percent on the unit itself. You collect the excise tax. Then you have to go back to the tax-exempt government agency, have them fill out their paperwork, submit it over, and then turn back to refund it. We are just trying to clean up the bureaucracies that are 100 years out of date.

It is not that hard. Make up your mind. Do you want broader adoption of nonlethal technology so our brothers and sisters don't die?

Think of some of the crappy things that have happened in our society over the last 10, 20 years because of the discharge of a firearm in law enforcement. It does not need to be that way.

This is actually the second or third rewrite of this bill as we try to make the anti-firearm groups happy. It turns out we would meet their requests, and then they would change their standard. The problem or the disagreement kept changing.

I don't know what the motivation is for playing games, but we bring this to the floor with honest hearts. We want our brothers and sisters not to die in this moment of violence. I would think there would be this almost giddy optimism that technology is bringing us here. Instead, it continues to be the moving excuse of why to oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 10, 2025.

Hon. PAM BONDI,  
*Attorney General, Department of Justice,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. DAN DRISCOLL,  
*Acting Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,  
Firearms and Explosives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. ROBERT LEIDER,  
*Chief Counsel, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,  
Firearms and Explosives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. SCOTT BESSENT,  
*Secretary of the Treasury,  
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC.*

Hon. ROBERT CEKADA,  
*Deputy Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,  
Firearms and Explosives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. MARY G. RYAN,  
*Administrator, Alcohol, Tobacco Tax and Trade  
Bureau, Washington, DC.*

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI, SECRETARY BESSENT, DIRECTOR DRISCOLL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR CEKADA, AND CHIEF COUNSEL LEIDER, AND ADMINISTRATOR RYAN: As former law enforcement officers, we write to share our concerns regarding the outdated federal classification of modern less-than-lethal technologies and provide an update on the strong legislative progress of H.R. 2189, the Law Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act, and H.R. 4242, the Innovate Less Lethal to De-Escalate Tax Modernization Act. H.R. 2189 has received significant bipartisan support and was marked up and approved by the House Judiciary Committee with favorable guidance on November 18, 2025.

H.R. 2189 addresses a serious and growing challenge: outdated statutory language within the 1968 Gun Control Act (GCA) that unintentionally classifies certain non-lethal devices as firearms. As technology has advanced, this decades-old framework has failed to keep pace, creating regulatory outcomes that run counter to modern policing needs and Congress's original intent.

A clear example is the TASER T10. Although engineered expressly for less-than-lethal use, it has been classified as a firearm solely because its propulsion system uses a small primer charge to expel its non-lethal projectiles. Older TASER models also contain a primer, but because those devices utilize compressed air released from a punctured gas cylinder to expel the projectile, they fall outside the GCA definition. The

T10's updated, gas-less propulsion system triggers firearm classification under the statute, even though the device is no more dangerous and, in many respects, safer than previous models that remain unregulated under the GCA.

This misclassification restricts access to modern, effective less-than-lethal tools for law enforcement, tribal agencies, correctional institutions, and healthcare facilities. It also slows innovation in technologies explicitly designed to de-escalate encounters and reduce the need for deadly force, an outcome directly at odds with public safety goals nationwide.

H.R. 2189 corrects this problem by establishing a modernized definition of a "less-than-lethal projectile device" and creating a DOJ-guided, multi-step classification process to ensure these devices are evaluated consistently, accurately, and safely. This framework ensures that only true less-than-lethal devices fall within the updated category while preventing unintended loopholes or misuse.

H.R. 4242 harmonizes tax statutes with the classification framework in H.R. 2189. It ensures consistent federal treatment across the National Firearms Act (NFA) and the Firearms and Ammunition Excise Tax (FAET), reduces administrative burdens, and restores long-standing tax treatment for federal law enforcement agencies. Today, federal agencies such as the U.S. Marshal Service are not exempt from paying the FAET on less-than-lethal devices. Historical payments of the FAET tax from a federal law enforcement agency, such as the U.S. Marshals Service, are not revenue for the federal government because they are also an expense. The reforms advanced by H.R. 4242 have previously been scored as having a de minimis effect on federal revenue.

Modernizing policy for less-lethal capabilities has the backing of a wide range of respected organizations representing both law enforcement and community voices. These include:

Law Enforcement & Public Safety Organizations

Fraternal Order of Police (FOP)  
Major County Sheriffs of America

National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)

Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association (HAPCOA)

Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)

Civic, Community & Reform-Focused Organizations

African American Mayors Association  
Next Generation Alumni Leadership Council

Prince Jones Jr. Foundation  
Coalition of Moms Against Police Brutality

This broad coalition reflects a shared understanding across communities, law enforcement, and advocacy groups that improving access to less-than-lethal tools is essential for enhancing safety, reducing harm, and achieving better outcomes in police-community interactions.

Given the bipartisan support in Congress, the backing of leading law enforcement and community organizations, and the clear public-safety benefits associated with resolving misclassifications in federal law, we respectfully request the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of the Treasury's (USDT) full support for H.R. 2189 and H.R. 4242. DOJ and USDT's leadership are critical to ensuring federal law aligns with modern technology, supports de-escalation, and advances the safety of both officers and the communities they serve.

If you have further questions, please contact Allie Esau, Deputy Chief of Staff for Congressman Pete Stauber.

Sincerely,

PETE STAUBER,  
TROY NEHLS,  
JOHN RUTHERFORD,  
GABE EVANS,  
CLAY HIGGINS,  
MIKE EZELL,  
*Members of Congress.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 19, 2025.

Hon. PAM BONDI,  
*Attorney General of the United States,  
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.*

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL BONDI: As the former Chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs, as well as the Representative of Wyoming, home of the Wind River Reservation and the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho tribes, I am writing to thank the Department of Justice (DOJ) for renewing its efforts to prioritize public safety and justice throughout Indian Country. In the spirit of helping to improve public safety on Native American reservations, I am writing to request the assistance and support of the U.S. Department of Justice in advancing H.R. 2189, the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act of 2025.

H.R. 2189 arises from a need to make less-than-lethal projectile devices more accessible and affordable for all law enforcement, and this legislation is of even more significance for Native American tribal police departments. If enacted, this legislation would ensure that Native American tribal police departments are not subjected to unnecessary and counterproductive roadblocks, delays, and costs when acquiring less-than-lethal projectile devices.

For context, H.R. 2189 defines a less-than-lethal projectile device to include only those devices that meet all the following tests:

The device is not designed or intended to expel, and may not be readily converted to accept and discharge, ammunition commonly used in handguns, rifles, or shotguns.

The device is not designed or intended to expel, and may not be readily converted to accept and discharge, any other projectile at a velocity exceeding 500 feet per second.

The device is designed and intended to be used in a manner that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury.

The device does not accept, and is not able to be readily modified to accept, an ammunition feeding device loaded through the inside of a pistol grip.

The device does not accept, and is not able to be readily modified to accept, an ammunition feeding device commonly used in semi-automatic firearms.

This bill is needed because, in the antiquated definition of a "firearm" under the Gun Control Act of 1968 ("GCA"), a device that meets all of the above specifications can still be classified as a firearm by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives ("ATF") if the device uses the action of an explosive to expel a non-lethal projectile. This is true even if that action of an explosive is merely a standard small arms primer without any kind of propellant. Classifying a less-than-lethal projectile device as a "firearm" makes it more difficult, costly, and time-consuming to manufacture innovative new technologies for law enforcement. Additionally, law enforcement officers can be unfairly subjected to higher levels of liability exposure for discharging a "firearm" than a less-than-lethal device.

Despite these issues, federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies still have the ability to bulk order less-than-lethal projectile devices and traditional lethal firearms

directly to their facilities, as 18 U.S.C. §925(a)(1) provides an exception for federal, state, and local governments. This exception is routinely used by local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies to cut down on burdensome and unnecessary administrative waste. However, as recently as late 2023, the ATF took the position that Native American tribes and their law enforcement departments do not qualify for the 18 U.S.C. §925(a)(1) exception based on the plain statutory text.

Accordingly, whenever a Native American tribal police department acquires any kind of firearm—including one that is in actuality a less-than-lethal projectile device—for duty use by its officers, it is treated as if it were a private security company under our nation's federal firearms laws. This means that the tribal police departments cannot have a bulk order of firearms shipped directly to their police department and instead must send an authorized representative of the tribal police department to a Federal Firearms Licensee ("FFL") to do an over-the-counter transfer. The only narrow exception to this general rule that the ATF has identified is the so called "cross-deputization" of an officer. Individual Native American tribal police officers who are cross-deputized as a federal law enforcement officer by the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs ("BIA") and have permission from their supervisor at the BIA may utilize 18 U.S.C. §925(a)(1), but only for ordering weapons for their direct individual use, and not for their department.

This present policy has many civil and criminal implications for tribal police departments, especially given that this nuance is not widely explained to FFLs or the public. Additionally, the exclusion of Native American tribes and their law enforcement departments creates many logistical difficulties in states where there are limits on the number of firearms that can be acquired within a month, especially for tribal reservations that are located in more than one U.S. state. This present state of affairs is further complicated by the fact that many tribal reservations are geographically located in regions of the United States that do not have FFLs close by.

H.R. 2189 represents a major step forward in creating parity for Native American tribal police and ensuring that all law enforcement agencies have access to innovative less-than-lethal technology. I believe that H.R. 2189 and other legislative proposals like it that seek to improve the capabilities of Native American tribal police will make a quantifiable difference in improving public safety for men, women, and children who live in Indian Country. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I, along with the sponsors and co-sponsors of this legislation, look forward to collaborating with your office on this issue.

Sincerely,

HARRIET M. HAGEMAN,  
Member of Congress.

H.R. 4242: INNOVATE LESS LETHAL TO DE-ESCALATE TAX MODERNIZATION ACT

Lead Sponsors: Rep David Schweikert (R-AZ) and Rep Greg Stanton (D-AZ)  
50 Bipartisan Co-Sponsors across 23 states  
Tax Policy Alignment:

The legislation aligns the new less-lethal category outlined in H.R. 2189 with the National Firearms Act of 1934 (Tax) and harmonizes other tax code provisions to ensure all less-lethal devices are taxed consistently. The CBO scored the provision in the 118th congress and it has a de minimis impact on the U.S. Treasury.

FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION EXCISE TAX  
("FAET")

The bill will harmonize H.R. 2189 and continues the exemption of certain less-than-le-

thal projectile devices, shells, and cartridges designed for use in such devices from the Firearms and Ammunition Excise Tax (FAET).

The legislation provision will have a de-minimis impact on tax revenues because modern less-than-lethal tools and technologies are almost exclusively sold to official governmental end-users or exported for use by official government end-users abroad. CBO scored in 2024 with a de-minimis score.

The bill is a companion bill with HR 2189 (Fitzgerald/Correa) and ensures a consistent and harmonious federal approach to the Department of Treasury & the DOJ updating and maintaining clear compliance guidance for less-than-lethal projectile devices.

The legislation corrects a key issue for federal law enforcement. Unlike the U.S. armed forces, state and local law enforcement agencies such as the U.S. Marshal Service are not exempt from paying the FAET on less-than-lethal devices. The legislation returns the U.S. Marshal Service and other federal agencies to the status quo of not paying a ten or eleven percent tax on the purchase of less-than-lethal devices.

A historical payment of FAET tax from a federal law enforcement agency such as the U.S. Marshal Service is not actually revenue for the federal government because it is also an expense.

TAX POLICY—NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT OF 1934

Legislation will harmonize H.R. 2189 and continues the exemption of certain less-than-lethal projectile devices, shells, and cartridges designed for use in such devices from the National Firearms Act (NFA) of 1934.

The NFA was implemented in response to mobsters' use of machine guns in the 1930s. The NFA makes the product subject to making and transfer taxes, transfer restrictions, additional licensing and registration requirements, and even more stringent record-keeping standards.

This provision will significantly reduce the administrative burdens and processing delays for less-than-lethal projectile devices presently designed in a configuration that brings it under the regulatory purview of the NFA.

H.R. 2189 ESTABLISHES A TECHNICAL FIX ESTABLISHING A LESS-LETHAL CLASSIFICATION PROCESS FOR THE DOJ

H.R. 2189 simply distinguishes, advanced lifesaving less-than-lethal projectile devices from firearms without touching the historical definition. H.R. 2189 establishes a clear classification process for the Department of Justice to use when evaluating a "less-than-lethal projectile device." A device must pass all of the following tests to qualify:

Are designed or intended to be used in a manner not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury;

Cannot expel (or be readily converted to expel) any projectile at a velocity over 500 feet per second;

Cannot use (or be readily converted to use) ammunition in a handgun, rifle & shotgun (no bullets);

Cannot accept (or be readily converted to accept) a magazine into the device's grip; and

Cannot use (or be readily converted to use) magazines for semiautomatic firearms.

The legislation requires that the Attorney General render a classification decision within 90 days of a request submitted to ATF for a determination.

The federal definition of a firearm under the Gun Control Act of 1968 is currently:

(A) any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; (B) the frame or re-

ceiver of any such weapon; (C) any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or (D) any destructive device. Such term does not include an antique firearm.

As amended by HR 2189, the definition of a firearm would be:

(A) any weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; (B) the frame or receiver of any such weapon; (C) any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or (D) any destructive device. Such term does not include an antique firearm or a less-than-lethal projectile device (as defined in the multi-part test discussed above).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are barely 2 months into this new year, and yet we have already had 35 mass shootings, devastating communities across the country.

If only two or three people are killed, it hardly makes national news anymore. We can be sure after every major incident that Republicans will offer their thoughts and prayers and then proceed to obstruct anyone who wants to do anything to increase gun safety.

Instead of addressing the serious tragedy, the illness that plagues our country with gun violence, Republicans today propose a new loophole, a dangerous loophole for so-called less-than-lethal devices. Once they are no longer considered firearms under the Federal definition, protective rules go away. That means no background checks. That means no serial number on the equipment so that the police can trace it if a criminal is using it.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Arizona, but using his example of a woman coming at a police officer with a knife, this bill does nothing for the police officer. He can get full access to less-than-lethal weapons now, but the woman, if she had a mental health problem and was barred from a firearm, she could now go buy one of these less-than-lethal devices.

In fact, it is not just one woman in Arizona. There are 5 million convicted felons in this country. There are 7 million people with mental health conditions. They are all barred from getting a firearm, and this dangerous loophole is designed to ensure that they now will see a giant sign saying, "Come get your weapon," because they no longer will be prohibited from getting one of these weapons, while the police officers, the law enforcement officers across this country, get no benefit. In fact, their job is made more difficult because these weapons can no longer be traced when used by one of these convicted felons who chooses to engage in other criminal activity.

These less-than-lethal devices, as they have been labeled, include tasers. There is one story after another, horrible stories, with details of criminals who have used tasers as they raped and abused their victims.

Beanbag rounds, we had those used in Austin against a number of teenagers. They may be called less than lethal,

but these teens required multiple life-saving surgeries to bring them back to decent health, some with serious disabilities.

With homemade alterations, which can occur with these less-than-lethal weapons, they can become more rapid-fire. They can become much more dangerous and still untraceable weapons.

There are so many things that we could be doing in this Congress concerning gun safety. Mr. THOMPSON has requested a universal background check—not to deny anyone, but to ensure that someone with a mental health condition or some other condition, someone you do not want getting a gun, to ensure safety through that background check. That has been widely supported by law enforcement.

There is a concern about the weapons of war that are brought onto our streets and kill multiple people. There are a number of reasonable measures that have been advocated by one group after another across this country to make our streets safer and to have parents, when they send their children off to school, know they will come home and won't have to spend all their time fearing the kind of violence that we saw in Uvalde, Texas, that led to the deaths of so many little children.

□ 1000

These are things that Congress could be working on right now. This loophole that will allow more people who should not have a gun because of their criminal history or their mental health condition will allow them to get that weapon. Real public safety means fewer weapons on our streets, not more loopholes.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is about time that we support the Law-Enforcement Innovate to De-Escalate Act. This crucial legislation ensures that law enforcement officers have access to the best, less-than-lethal technologies for de-escalation.

Under current law, certain new less-than-lethal technologies are included under the National Firearms Act, NFA, a law designed to regulate firearms. However, due to the definition of firearms under the NFA, this includes less-than-lethal devices such as the new TASER 10. This bill will modernize the NFA to include the less-than-lethal category to ensure that devices like the TASER 10, that are not designated to be lethal, are not included under the NFA's taxes and regulations design for firearms for use by municipalities, not individuals.

I am honored to be a cosponsor of this bill along with, I think, at least 22 commonsense Democrats, and I strongly supported its passage through the House Ways and Means committee.

However, I am disappointed that so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to support this

commonsense bill. Instead, they want to politicize and talk about completely unrelated matters.

While some on the other side resort to fear-mongering, House Republicans and, as I said 22, I believe, commonsense Democrats, are committed to ensuring law enforcement has the tools and resources they need to keep our communities safe.

Every major police organization is supporting the passage of this legislation, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Major County Sheriffs Association, and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. This is a pro-police, pro-community, and lifesaving piece of legislation.

I urge the Senate to vote on this bill expeditiously. I thank Representative FITZGERALD, Speaker JOHNSON, Leader SCALISE, and, of course, Chairman SMITH for bringing this bill to the floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out, my good friend from New York was talking about how important this is for law enforcement to have access to these types of tasers. As I said in my opening remarks, all 50 States already have access to these tasers.

As a matter of fact, in New York, the gentlewoman who just spoke talked about their need to have them. The New York Police Department uses these tasers and the Syracuse Police Department uses these tasers. As a matter of fact, their use is funded by a State grant. The Ramapo Police Department uses these tasers.

In Arizona, where my good friend Mr. SCHWEIKERT is from, the Phoenix Police Department uses these tasers. The Mesa Police Department uses these tasers. The Scottsdale Police Department uses these tasers.

This is not about providing access for law enforcement to use these tasers. They are already used in all 50 States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, for the past year, Republicans have done nothing to address rising grocery prices, rising energy prices, and rising healthcare prices. What is the one thing they are willing to do? Making tasers more accessible to dangerous people. It is unbelievable.

On January 21, 2023, my hometown of Monterey Park, California, suffered a mass shooting that killed 11 of our neighbors. It remains the deadliest mass shooting in Los Angeles County's history.

Monterey Park, and every community across this country, deserves to be safe from violence, whether from guns, tasers, or anything else, but Republicans are working to make our communities less safe by handing over access of weapons to individuals we know

should not have them and making them far harder for law enforcement to track.

We should be focused on keeping our communities safe, not voting to flood our streets with even more weapons.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, you absolutely cannot make this stuff up that you are hearing from the other side of the aisle. When they talk about the affordability crisis, let's talk about the affordability crisis.

Gas prices are the lowest they have been in 5 years. Inflation is the lowest it has been in 4 years. Just in the first year of President Trump, wages grew more than all 4 years under Joe Biden. We are in an inflation crisis that President Trump inherited because of the spending spree, the \$10 trillion spending spree, that the Democrats did when they controlled the White House, the House, and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker. I have a speech written for this today. I am going to speak from the heart.

As one of just a few people that have represented their constituents in Congress, I was one of the few that wore the uniform. I was one of the few that was shot while off-duty. I was one of the few that had a gun malfunction when it was pointed at my head. I was one of the few that ran into the fire. I was one of the few that was on our tackle response team.

When they talk about tasers, it is a tool that we can use in law enforcement to save lives, not only the officer, not only the subject or the suspect, but bystanders.

For my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to try to defend the philosophy that we don't need those or this piece of legislation that involves the tax code isn't legit, it is just atrocious.

Here is a list of people that support it: The African American Mayors Association. The Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, Major County Sheriffs of America, Peace Officers Research Association of California, and so many others.

You can ask every law enforcement officer on the streets of America whether they want this to move forward and pass and become law. The answer is yes because the technology continues to grow and grow.

When I first started in law enforcement, we had one shot at the taser. When we would cross draw, flip the switch up, bring it up, taser, taser, taser. We only had one. Later on in my career, we had two options. This gives us, in some cases, 10 options to subdue a subject that is violent and is going to either harm the officer, bystanders, or, more importantly, themselves.

Cross draw, flip up, taser, taser, taser.

This is a good bill, and my colleagues on the other sides of the aisle know it

is a good bill. In fact, one of the co-sponsors won't even come and talk about it because his majority, Mr. Speaker, doesn't want it. This is the extension of defund the police. I have had it.

□ 1010

We need to protect law enforcement. We are the ones who call them when we are in harm. They come to the fight. They will be there when we call 911.

Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle won't support something that defends the cops and helps them with another tool on their tool belt to make sure they are safe, the subject is safe, and any bystanders are safe. It is unconscionable.

This is a great bill. I wholeheartedly support it, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will too.

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

I thank Mr. STAUBER for his time in public safety. I thank him for being a cop. We all owe a deep gratitude to those in uniform who keep us safe.

As I mentioned when I first made my opening statement, my son is a cop. I appreciate him, and I appreciate all his colleagues.

However, it is disingenuous to stand on this floor and say that this bill is needed so cops can have access to this particular type of taser technology.

Mr. STAUBER is from Minnesota. I just want to point out that Minnesota uses this. The Minnetonka Police Department uses this technology. The Minneapolis Police Department uses these tasers. The St. Charles Police Department uses these tasers. The Hastings Police Department uses these tasers. The Brooklyn Park Police Department uses these tasers.

This is not about police not having access to this taser technology. They have it, and they can use it. It is not about that. Please focus on the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, 90 seconds is the shortest I have ever spoken.

Mr. Speaker, if someone is actually listening to our discussion, the Democrats have made it clear: Hey, lots of law enforcement have this product.

Wonderful. We are trying to explain that this is a segment of the tax code we are trying to make easier and more efficient. Once again, just read the bill. It is remarkably simple.

Mr. Speaker, you have an excise tax. You have to go through all these steps to collect it then to refund it.

So my friend from California—he is a good guy. We have done a number of bills together over the years—made my argument. This is actually in wide distribution across the country, and there is another generation of technology, hopefully, coming and another one coming.

It is more than just the taser in the hand. It may be the thing on the wall that protects my synagogue or my school or those things. There is a revolution of nonlethal coming so that people don't have to die.

I thank the gentleman for explaining that it is in wide distribution. Now let's deal with the things in the tax code that add bureaucracy and costs. If we both support the fact that these should be in the hands of people protecting our public, then let's remove some of the bureaucracy that makes it more expensive.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for making my point.

If it is about the tax code, then let's address that. That is not what this bill does. This opens a huge loophole that will allow people who are a danger to themselves and others to have access to devices that none of us believe that they should have access to.

If it was all about what Mr. SCHWEIKERT said, then why didn't the majority take my amendment that I filed that would have taken the ghost gun loophole issue off the table?

If it is about the tax code, then let's deal with the tax code. However, as Mr. DOGGETT made the argument about domestic abusers, these are people who perpetrate the most heinous of crimes. That is why when this House and Senate passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, we closed the boyfriend loophole to ensure that abusive boyfriends were blocked from accessing firearms, the same way we block abusive husbands from getting their hands on weapons.

The Gun Control Act is the Federal statute that requires background checks which block these abusers from getting their hands on firearms. This bill weakens the Gun Control Act and would allow convicted domestic abusers to purchase long-range tasers and ghost guns. That is not what my colleagues on the other side are suggesting that they want to do.

So why don't we deal with the tax issue? We can do it. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is right here. That is an easy one for us to fix. But don't create a loophole big enough to drive a truckload of ghost guns through.

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

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

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

Again, this bill does not do what my colleagues on the other side are suggesting that it does. They say that police need this bill in order to have access to and use this new taser, this new innovation in tasers. As I have pointed out a number of times, everyone who has spoken, in their home State they

use these tasers. The police departments have access to these, and they use them.

As a matter of fact, all 50 States use these tasers today. I have a list of all those.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD that list of States.

SAMPLING OF STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CORRECTIONAL ADOPTION OF AXON'S TASER 10 (FIREARM-CLASSIFIED TASER)

Despite the claim from proponents of H.R. 2189 and H.R. 4242 that the bills are needed for state and local law enforcement to be able to obtain and use Taser 10, in reality, law enforcement departments across the country in every state have already obtained and use these devices—making this legislation unnecessary.

#### ALABAMA

Baldwin County Sheriff's Office  
Spanish Fort Police Department  
Mobile Police Department

#### ALASKA

Anchorage Police Department  
Kodiak Police Department  
Bristol Bay Borough Police Department

#### ARIZONA

Phoenix Police Department  
Another article on procurement  
Mesa Police Department  
Scottsdale Police Department

#### ARKANSAS

Little Rock Police Department  
Pulaski County Sheriff's Office  
Van Buren Police Department  
Bryant Police Department

#### CALIFORNIA

San Diego Police Department  
Another article on procurement  
Santa Clara Sheriff's Office: A pilot program in county jails  
Los Angeles Sheriff's Office: —“a CEW deployment is an intermediate use of force tool”

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department  
Official Temple Station  
Murrieta Police Department  
Desert Hot Springs Police Department  
Hemet Police Department  
Modesto Police Department  
Orange County Sheriff's Office  
Santa Ana Police Department  
Anaheim Police Department

#### COLORADO

Denver Police Department  
Denver Regional Transportation District  
Montezuma Police Department Taser-10  
Challenge Coins  
Montezuma County Sheriff's Office  
Cortez Police Department  
Mountain View Police Department  
Colorado Parks and Wildlife  
Cherry Hills Village Police Department  
Fort Collins Police Department

#### CONNECTICUT

Wallingford Police Department  
Fairfield Police Department  
Tybee Island Police Department  
East Hartford Police Department  
Hartford Police Department

#### DELAWARE

Delaware County Park Police Department  
Wilmington Police Department

#### FLORIDA

Bradenton Police Department  
Oviedo Police Department  
Naples Police Department  
Port St. Lucie Police Department  
Seminole County Sheriff's Office

#### GEORGIA

Dougherty County Sheriff's Office

Clayton County Police Department  
Pelham Police Department  
St. Mary's Police Department  
Trenton (GA) Police Department  
Nashville (GA) Police Department  
DeKalb County Department of Police Services

## HAWAII

Hawaii Department of Law Enforcement  
Hawaii County Police Department

## IDAHO

Chelan County Sheriff's Office  
Idaho Peace Officer Standards and Training

## ILLINOIS

Oregon City (IL) Police Department  
Chicago Police Department  
Woodstock Police Department  
Joliet Police Department  
City of Dekalb Police Department  
Monmouth Police Department: Funded by a state grant.  
McCook Police Department: Funded by a state grant.

Rockton Police Department

## INDIANA

Clarksville Police Department  
Bloomington Police Department  
Rockville Police Department

## IOWA

Polk County Sheriff's Office  
North Liberty Police Department: "Use of Force Report" says Electronic Control Devices are not a "deadly force."

## KANSAS

Riley County Police Department  
Wichita Police Department  
Topeka Police Department: Policy and Procedural Manual says "ECW is a less lethal force alternative."

Rawlins County Sheriff's Office

## KENTUCKY

Louisville Police Department  
Newport Police Department  
Ashland Police Department  
Fort Wright Police Department

## LOUISIANA

New Orleans Police Department  
Shreveport City Marshal's Office  
Caddo Parish Sheriff's Office  
Orleans Parish Sheriff's Office  
Central Police Department

## MAINE

Old Towne Police Department  
Maine Criminal Justice Academy: Approved Taser 10 as an authorized "less than lethal" device statewide.

## MARYLAND

Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services  
Bladensburg Police Department  
University Park Police Department  
University of Maryland, Baltimore Police Department: The 'Use of Force Pyramid' says tasers are a Level 5 of 6 (6 being "deadly force").

## MASSACHUSETTS

Quincy Police Department  
Chelmsford Police Department  
Newton Police Department  
Boston Police Department

## MICHIGAN

Dearborn Police Department  
Chelsea Police Department  
Grand Traverse County Sheriff's Office  
Macomb County Sheriff's Office  
Muskegon County Sheriff's Office  
Canton Township Police Department

## MINNESOTA

Minnetonka Police Department  
Minneapolis Police Department

St. Charles Police Department  
Hastings Police Department  
Brooklyn Park Police Department

## MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi Highway Safety Patrol  
Laurel Police Department  
Meridian Police Department  
University of Mississippi University Police and Campus Safety  
Ridgeland Police Department

## MISSOURI

Saint Louis Police Department  
Springfield Police Department: The 'Use of Force' chart says tasers are a Level 4 of 6 (6 being "deadly force").

Ballwin Police Department  
Ferguson Police Department  
Lake Winnebago Police Department  
Jefferson College Law Enforcement Academy

## MONTANA

Missoula Police Department  
Montana Department of Corrections: Offers training courses for "new probation and parole officers and others needing TASER 10 Certification."

Billings Probation and Parole Officers training to prepare for use.

Lake County Forest Preserves Police Department

## NEBRASKA

Lincoln Police Department  
Clay County Sheriff's Office

## NEVADA

Sparks Police Department

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Manchester Police Department  
Londonderry Police Department  
Portsmouth Police Department

## NEW JERSEY

The state government has explicitly approved the use of Taser 10  
Newark Police Department

## NEW MEXICO

Bernalillo County Sheriff's Office  
Santa Fe Police Department  
Santa Fe County Sheriff's Office  
New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy

## NEW YORK

New York City Police Department  
Syracuse Police Department: Funded by a state grant  
Ramapo Police Department

## NORTH CAROLINA

Raleigh Police Department  
Wake County Sheriff's Office  
North Carolina Department of Adult Corrections

Goldsboro Police Department

## NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Highway Patrol  
Ward County Sheriff's Department  
Minnehaha County Corrections

## OHIO

Ohio State Department of Rehabilitation and Correction  
DRC wants to expand use to all Ohio State prisons.

Cleveland Police Department  
Norwood Police Department  
Ashland County Sheriff's Office  
Fairfield Township Police Department  
Franklin Township Police Department

## OKLAHOMA

Bartlesville Police Department  
Comanche County Sheriff's Department  
Temple Police Department  
Broken Arrow Police Department

## OREGON

Eagle Point Police Department  
Tualatin Police Department

Astoria Police Department

## PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania State University Police and Public Safety Department  
Upper Gwynedd Township Police Department

Scranton Police Department  
Waynesboro Police Department  
Bucks County Sheriff's Office

## RHODE ISLAND

South Kingstown Police Department  
Triverton Police Department  
Hopkinton Police Department

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Florence County Sheriff's Office  
Moncks Corner Police Department  
Hardeeville Police Department

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Watertown Police Department  
Somerset Police Department  
Codington County Sheriff's Office: Includes County jail staff

## TENNESSEE

Nashville Police Department  
Clarksville Police Department  
Monterey Police Department  
Loudon County Sheriff's Office

## TEXAS

Austin Police Department  
El Paso Police Department  
Ennis Police Department  
Plano Police Department  
Fredericksburg City Police Department  
League City Police Department  
Another article on procurement  
Guadalupe County Sheriff's Office  
City of Dallas Police Department  
DFW Airport Department of Public Safety

## UTAH

Salt Lake City Police Department  
Kanab City Police Department  
Cedar City Police Department

## VERMONT

St. Albans

## VIRGINIA

Falls Church Police Department  
Virginia Commonwealth University Police Department  
City of Fredericksburg Police Department

## WASHINGTON

Seattle Police Department  
Bellevue Police Department  
Anacortes Police Department  
Everett Police Department  
Thurston County Sheriff's Office  
Clark County Sheriff's Office

## WEST VIRGINIA

Spencer Police Department

## WISCONSIN

Waukesha Police Department: In Rep. Fitzgerald's district  
Brookfield Police Department: In Rep. Fitzgerald's district

River Hills Police Department: 'Use of Force' guidelines says Taser 10 is considered "non-lethal force."

Grand Chute Police Department  
Another article on procurement

## WYOMING

Green River Police Department  
Laramie County Sheriff's Office

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Also, on the issue of domestic abusers, the idea that this body would make it easier for domestic abusers to get new technology in tasers is just beyond explanation. We should be extremely worried about these people getting this type of technology.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 9, 2026, to House leadership.

FEBRUARY 9, 2026.

Speaker MIKE JOHNSON,  
House of Representatives.  
Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
House of Representatives.

To Speaker Johnson and Leader Jeffries: In 2014, a Washington, DC resident (name withheld to protect the victim's privacy) abused his wife with a TASER, repeatedly shocking her in the face and head. While she was still suffering the effects of the TASER, he repeatedly hit her in the head with a baseball bat, punched her multiple times in the face, and then sexually assaulted her. In 2018, a New Jersey man threatened his girlfriend repeatedly with a TASER in the course of raping her several times over multiple incidents. Eventually, he carried through with his threat, tasing her in the neck and raping and sodomizing her.

These incidents are both horrific and emblematic of a larger issue: domestic abusers' use of weapons to exert power and coercive control over their victims. Abusers threaten the victim, the children, pets, and others. As a nation, we should erect more barriers to domestic abusers acquiring weapons, not demolish existing protections. But that is exactly what H.R. 2189/S. 1283 would do by undermining laws designed to keep so-called "less-than-lethal projectile devices," such as TASERS classified as firearms, and ghost guns out of the hands of adjudicated abusers.

To be clear, despite their marketing, TASERS are not always "less-than-lethal," as claimed in H.R. 2189. Perhaps they are less lethal than other firearms, but between 2012 and 2021, 538 people were killed by TASERS or stun guns. And studies that have found TASERS have only minor health impacts were not only primarily funded by the manufacturer, they did not mimic real-life situations, having exclusively healthy subjects, a short exposure time, and no long-term follow-up. Moreover, domestic violence continues or for some populations even escalates during pregnancy, and there is evidence that the use of a TASER on a pregnant woman can cause her to miscarry.

Under current federal law, adjudicated domestic abusers (with a few notable exceptions) are prohibited from possessing TASERS that are classified as firearms in addition to ghost guns and traditional firearms. Removing such TASERS and other "less-than-lethal projectile devices" modified to be lethal from the definition of a "firearm" in 18 U.S.C. 921(a) will not only allow adjudicated domestic abusers to acquire projectile weapons without a background check, it will make it perfectly legal for a domestic abuser—and other people convicted of violent and abhorrent crimes such as felony child molestation—to possess these weapons. While that might not be the intent of the bill authors, that will be the real-life impact.

H.R. 2189/S. 1283 will have another chilling unintended consequence: domestic abusers and others who are prohibited under federal law from possessing firearms will modify "less-than-lethal projectile devices" to circumvent federal laws and regulations, including those regulating so-called 'ghost guns.' In 2022, an adjudicated domestic abuser who was prohibited from possessing firearms used a ghost gun to murder his three daughters in a Sacramento church during a supervised visitation then murdered the chaperone and killed himself. Unable to pass a background check, he assembled his own firearm from untraceable gun parts which were unregulated at the time. Since that incident, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives issued a regulation, upheld by the United States Supreme Court in *Bondi v. Vanderstock*, to require background checks and serial numbers

on unfinished frames and receivers and on some weapons parts kits. But only firearms frames and receivers are thus regulated; removing "less-than-lethal projectile devices" from the definition of "firearm" in 18 U.S.C. 921(a) would also allow ghost guns modified from such devices to proliferate among individuals with criminal records. And since only firearms frames and receivers are regulated, kits to modify such devices into fully-lethal projectile weapons would be entirely legal and unregulated. Plus, while the bill stipulates that "less-than-lethal projectile devices . . . must be designed and intended to be used in a manner that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury," the bill fails to prohibit or even acknowledge the inevitable modification of "less-than-lethal projectile devices" into entirely-lethal projectile devices. Once again, adjudicated domestic abusers who are prohibited from possessing firearms under federal law would be legally permitted to possess a firearm-equivalent, with the same lethal capacity, due simply to semantics.

So, now, let us return to the depraved domestic and sexual violence offenders whose heinous acts were detailed in the opening paragraph. Despite their use of TASERS to physically and sexually abuse their intimate partners and the attendant criminal convictions that would prohibit them from possessing firearms, immediately upon their release from prison these individuals would legally be permitted under federal law to acquire TASERS and other high-powered "less-than-lethal projectile devices" that today are classified as firearms. Moreover, once they obtained such weapons, there would be no barrier in federal law to obtain the necessary parts to modify them into lethal projectile weapons.

The purpose of this bill is truly perplexing. Not only will H.R. 2189/S. 1283 arm adjudicated domestic abusers and others who pose a danger to public safety, it in no way achieves its stated goals and is a solution in search of a problem. The federal classification of TASERS as firearms in no way precludes law enforcement agencies from accessing TASERS, just as it does not preclude them from accessing an array of any of the "less-than-lethal" devices currently classified as firearms. Law enforcement agencies are easily able to procure firearms, including "less-than-lethal projective devices" currently classified as firearms, with many civilian requirements for purchasing firearm—and federal taxes—being waived. And contrary to a further argument in support of H.R. 2189/S. 1283, removing "less-than-lethal projectile devices" from the federal definition of a "firearm" will not decrease law enforcement's liability for the use of deadly force. In terms of federal law, both regulations and courts have held that, on its own, the use of TASERS and other "less-than-lethal projectile devices" do not constitute deadly force. Moreover, even if that were not the case, changing the federal definition of a firearm to exclude TASERS and similar devices would in no way impact liability for using deadly force, because such liability outside the context of federal law enforcement is established in state and local law, which H.R. 2189/S. 1283 cannot alter.

So what, then, is the purpose of H.R. 2189/S. 1283? Perhaps it is to exempt individuals attempting to acquire TASERS and similar devices from undergoing a background check. In that case, the benefits to public safety are unclear, while we have amply demonstrated the risks. Perhaps an individual seeks to acquire such a device for self-protection. If the individual does not have a prohibiting record, they should be able to pass a firearms background check with no inconvenience to themselves—most firearms

background checks take only a few minutes to complete. And if they do have a prohibiting record, for the safety not only of victims and survivors of domestic violence but for public safety more broadly, they should not have access to either a "less-than-lethal" device or a fully-lethal firearm.

For all of these reasons, we oppose H.R. 2189/S. 1283, and we urge you to oppose it as well. If you have any questions, please reach out.

Sincerely,

Jewish Women International; Catholics for Family Peace Education and Research Initiative; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Hope Rise Thrive; Interfaith Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence; Legal Momentum; The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; Nuns Against Gun Violence; Safe Havens Interfaith Partnership Against Domestic Violence and Elder Abused; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas Justice Team; Ujima; The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community; United Church of Christ.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for folks who make the argument that people are afraid, they want to have the newest taser technology to keep themselves safe in the civilian space, I understand that. They are not precluded from being able to purchase and have this new technology in tasers. They just have to get a background check to make sure they aren't domestic abusers and to make sure they are not prohibited individuals who couldn't otherwise get firearms.

This bill does a lot more than the proponents are suggesting that it does. If, in fact, they want to deal with the issues that they stood on this floor today and talked about, they are all good issues, everybody will agree with that, let's do it. Let's draw the bill to deal with those issues. We could have done that had the majority accepted my bill that would have closed the ghost gun loophole, but they chose not to.

If they really want to make this bill do what they are claiming, then let's write a bill that does that. This bill doesn't do it. This puts American communities at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, based on the comments that we have been hearing from the other side, it is proof that they didn't take the time to read the seven-page bill that we are debating on the floor. That is because the accusations and the comments you have heard, Mr. Speaker, are clearly not identifiable of the legislation that is being debated.

This bill comes down to basic common sense. Our tax code should not put unnecessary barriers in front of technologies designed to reduce harm.

Representative SCHWEIKERT's legislation helps align our tax policy with our public safety goals. It supports innovation, it encourages less lethal means of law enforcement, and removes an outdated burden that never made much sense to begin with.

When Congress has the chance to make a straightforward fix that can contribute to safer communities and smarter policy, we should take it.

I commend Congressman SCHWEIKERT for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I congratulate the 22 brave Democrats who believe in less lethal force by sponsoring this legislation. I just wish there was more of that party.

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

□ 1020

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1057, 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—233

Aderholt	Cuellar	Harshbarger
Alford	Davidson	Hern (OK)
Allen	Davis (NC)	Higgins (LA)
Amodi (NV)	De La Cruz	Hill (AR)
Arrington	DesJarlais	Hinson
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Houchin
Bacon	Donalds	Hudson
Baird	Downing	Huizenga
Balderson	Dunn (FL)	Hurd (CO)
Barr	Edwards	Issa
Barrett	Ellzey	Jack
Baumgartner	Emmer	Jackson (TX)
Bean (FL)	Estes	James
Beatty	Evans (CO)	Johnson (SD)
Begich	Ezell	Jordan
Bentz	Fallon	Joyce (OH)
Bergman	Fedorchak	Joyce (PA)
Bice	Feenstra	Kean
Biggs (AZ)	Fine	Kelly (MS)
Biggs (SC)	Finstad	Kelly (PA)
Bilirakis	Fischbach	Kennedy (UT)
Bishop	Fitzgerald	Kiggans (VA)
Boebert	Fleischmann	Kiley (CA)
Bost	Flood	Kim
Boyle (PA)	Fong	Knott
Brecheen	Foxx	Kustoff
Bresnahan	Franklin, Scott	LaHood
Buchanan	Fry	LaLota
Burchett	Fulcher	Landsman
Burlison	Garbarino	Langworthy
Calvert	Gill (TX)	Latta
Cammack	Gimenez	Lawler
Carey	Golden (ME)	Lee (FL)
Carter (GA)	Goldman (TX)	Letlow
Carter (LA)	Gonzalez, V.	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Gooden	Lucas
Ciscomani	Gosar	Luttrell
Clarke (NY)	Graves	Mace
Cline	Gray	Mackenzie
Cloud	Griffith	Malliotakis
Clyde	Grothman	Maloy
Cole	Guest	Mann
Collins	Guthrie	Massie
Comer	Hageman	Mast
Correa	Hamadeh (AZ)	McCauley
Crane	Haridopolos	McClain
Crank	Harrigan	McClintock
Crawford	Harris (MD)	McCormick
Crenshaw	Harris (NC)	McDowell

McGuire	Rogers (AL)
Messmer	Rogers (KY)
Meuser	Rose
Miller (IL)	Rouzer
Miller (OH)	Roy
Miller (WV)	Rulli
Miller-Meeks	Rutherford
Mills	Salazar
Moolenaar	Scalise
Moore (AL)	Schmidt
Moore (NC)	Scholten
Moore (UT)	Schweikert
Moore (WV)	Scott, Austin
Moran	Self
Morhan	Sessions
Murphy	Shreve
Newhouse	Simpson
Norcross	Smith (MO)
Nunn (IA)	Smith (NE)
Obernoite	Smith (NJ)
Ogles	Smucker
Onder	Spartz
Owens	Stanton
Palmer	Stauber
Panetta	Stefanik
Patronis	Steil
Perez	Steube
Perry	Strong
Pfluger	Stutzman
Reschenthaler	

NAYS—185

Adams	Gomez
Aguilar	Goodlander
Amo	Green, Al (TX)
Ansari	Grijalva
Auchincloss	Harder (CA)
Balint	Hayes
Barragan	Himes
Bell	Horsford
Bera	Houlahan
Beyer	Hoyer
Bonamici	Hoyle (OR)
Brown	Huffman
Brownley	Ivey
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)
Bynum	Jacobs
Carbajal	Jayapal
Carson	Jeffries
Casar	Johnson (GA)
Case	Johnson (TX)
Casten	Kamlager-Dove
Castor (FL)	Kaptur
Cheriflus-	Keating
McCormick	Kelly (IL)
Chu	Kennedy (NY)
Cisneros	Khanna
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Latimer
Conaway	Lee (NV)
Costa	Lee (PA)
Courtney	Leger Fernandez
Craig	Levin
Crockett	Liccardo
Crow	Lieu
Daids (KS)	Lofgren
Davis (IL)	Lynch
Dean (PA)	Magaziner
DeGette	Mannion
DeLauro	Matsui
DelBene	McBath
Deluzio	McBride
DeSaulnier	McClain Delaney
Dexter	McClellan
Doggett	McCollum
Elfreth	McDonald Rivet
Escobar	McGarvey
Espallat	McGovern
Evans (PA)	McIver
Fields	Meeke
Figures	Menefee
Fitzpatrick	Menendez
Fletcher	Meng
Foster	Mfume
Foushee	Min
Frankel, Lois	Moore (WI)
Friedman	Morelle
Frost	Morrison
Garamendi	Moskowitz
Garcia (CA)	Mrvan
Garcia (IL)	Mullin
Garcia (TX)	Nadler
Gillen	Neal

NOT VOTING—13

Castro (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	Luna
Dingell	Gottheimer	Moulton
Goldman (NY)	Hunt	Murphy

Norman	Swalwell	Waters
Pingree		

□ 1045

Mr. COURTNEY changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. PEREZ changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Ms. KELLY of Illinois changed her vote from “present” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today due to an urgent commitment in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 70.

□ 1050

HONORING ROBERT ALLEN BISHOP, SR.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill this week to designate the Mahaffey Post Office in Mahaffey, Pennsylvania, as the Robert Allen Bishop, Sr. Post Office.

Bob was a Marine Corps veteran, a letter carrier for the U.S. Postal Service, and an outstanding member of the community. Born in 1936, Bob graduated from Punxsutawney Area High School in 1954. At age 22, he enlisted in the Marine Corps and completed an overseas tour in Japan and obtained the rank of corporal.

Following his military service, Bob returned to Pennsylvania and opened the Lightner and Bishop General Store with his wife, Jean. Today, the building that housed the general store is home to the Mahaffey Post Office.

Bob was a letter carrier for 36 years and received the Million Mile Award, which recognizes workers who drive over 1 million miles. He also served with the Mahaffey Volunteer Fire Department as an EMT.

Bob passed away on June 15, 2023.

Mr. Speaker, Bob dedicated his life to service, to his country and his community, and I look forward to renaming the Mahaffey Post Office in his honor.

CELEBRATING TET

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

Mr. TRAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Tet, the Vietnamese lunar new year.

The lunar new year is so much more than a date on the calendar. It is an opportunity for the Asian-American communities in California and across America to reflect on our past and to open our hearts to the promise of the future.