

I thank the officers for their unwavering service on behalf of our community.

MEDICALLY TAILORED MEALS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week in Massachusetts, I had the pleasure of speaking at the AMPL Institute's annual convening to learn about the latest research and hear directly from experts in the field of medically tailored meals.

Based within Community Servings, the largest nonprofit provider of medically tailored meals in New England, the AMPL Institute combines pioneering research, policy work, and provider education aimed at transforming the healthcare system so that medically tailored nutrition becomes a universally accessible standard of care.

The incredible work of Community Servings is what got me interested in, and now passionate about, expanding the reach of medically tailored meals. They are the reason I have introduced a bipartisan bill to pilot coverage of MTMs in traditional Medicare at hospitals across the country.

Medically tailored meals have the power to transform lives. They improve health outcomes, support vulnerable patients, and strengthen the Food Is Medicine movement.

It is time to pass my bipartisan bill, the Medically Tailored Home-Delivered Meals Program Act, to really advance the Food Is Medicine movement in this country.

HONORING OFFICER SUZANNE O OF MAUI

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, May 15, the Nation will observe Peace Officers Memorial Day. This year's observance is especially difficult and deeply personal for our Maui ohana.

Maui Police Department Officer Suzane O was added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial this spring. Officer O, a beloved daughter, sister, partner, auntie, and friend was killed in the line of duty in August 2025, when she encountered an armed suspect in response to a terroristic threatening call.

Raised in American Samoa and a graduate of Farrington High School, Officer O was a role model for many Pacific Islander girls. She was a dedicated public servant and a proud member of the MPD Honor Guard and had received a Certificate of Merit for her heroic efforts during our Maui wildfires.

Officer O is deeply missed by her family, friends, and colleagues.

All police officers and their families deeply understand the risks that come with putting on the uniform every single day. Today, we remember and honor the courage and the sacrifice of officers like Suzane O who have paid the ultimate price to keep our communities and our families safe.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5625, CASHLESS BAIL REPORTING ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6260, KEEPING VIOLENT OFFENDERS OFF OUR STREETS ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8365, MONITOR ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 96, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8469, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2027

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1275

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5625) to direct the Attorney General to make publicly available a list of each State and unit of local government that permits cashless bail, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6260) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit fraud in connection with posting bail. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8365) to provide for conditions on the appointment of monitors by courts, and for other purposes. All points of order

against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) expressing support for law enforcement officers. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8469) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2027, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

SEC. 6. (a) No amendment to H.R. 8469 shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 8 of this resolution.

(b) Each amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 8 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 7. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en

bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 8 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 8. During consideration of H.R. 8469 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 9. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 8469 for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1220

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Rules Committee met yesterday and reported out a rule providing for consideration of five measures: H.R. 5626, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act; H.R. 6260, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act of 2025; H.R. 8365, the Monitor Accountability Act; H. Con. Res. 96, Expressing Support For Law Enforcement Officers; and H.R. 8469, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2027.

House Resolution 1275 provides for consideration of H.R. 5625, H.R. 6260, and H.R. 8365, each under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate for each bill, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees, and provides for each bill one motion to recommitment.

The rule further provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 96, Expressing Support For Law Enforcement Officers, under a closed rule with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minor-

ity member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8469, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2027, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. The rule provides 1 motion to recommit and makes 51 amendments in order.

This rule will provide for consideration of several important bills, Mr. Speaker, that I believe will improve the safety of our local communities and the law enforcement officers that serve them. It will also bring the first appropriations bill for fiscal year 2027 to the floor so we can begin the process of passing the bills before the September 30 end of the fiscal year.

First, I would like to start by saying thank you to our law enforcement officers, particularly since this week is Police Week. We honor our law enforcement officers and the men and women who gave their lives in the line of duty.

I am glad we are bringing bills to the floor this week to do Congress' part in helping and honoring law enforcement officers. Among those is H.R. 6260, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act. This bill provides commonsense accountability measures for charitable bail funds. These are organizations that use money given as donations to bail out defendants, many of whom have been charged with violent felonies or whom are repeat offenders.

Charitable bail funds have consistently helped release violent criminals back onto our streets where they have committed robbery, assault, kidnapping, and even murder in some cases.

H.R. 6260 closes loopholes that have allowed for potential fraudulent practices and include charitable bail funds as entities "engaged in the business of insurance," thereby ensuring that charitable bail funds will be subject to the criminal provisions under Federal law that apply thereto.

Another bill in this rule is H.R. 5625, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act. This legislation requires the Department of Justice to publish an annual report listing the State and local governments that allow cashless bail for criminals who pose a clear threat to public safety.

Recently, destructive policies in some States and cities are allowed for the gradual elimination of monetary bail systems and, as a result, has led to increased crime. According to a March 2023 study conducted by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, the percentage of violent felony offenders who were rearrested increased from 62 to 72 percent.

The correlation is clear: Cashless bail policy leads to increased crime in our communities, and the American people should know if their local governments are participating in these ill-advised programs.

Additionally, this rule brings to the floor H.R. 8365, the Monitor Accountability Act. This bill provides for needed reforms for court monitors, which are independent officials whose job it is to conduct oversight during court proceedings. While many court monitors have performed their duties well, others have initiated unnecessarily long agreements and have charged government agencies with the expensive fees.

H.R. 8365 curbs the excesses of court monitors by imposing a maximum term of service, regulates the fee amount a monitor may charge, and sets general expectations for the court monitor industry. This bill codifies many of the recommendations that then-Attorney General Garland put into place after the Biden administration reviewed the Federal monitoring program.

This rule also brings up H. Con. Res. 96, a resolution that supports National Police Week by honoring the courageous law enforcement officers across our Nation who put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe.

This resolution expresses Congress' immense gratitude for the service and sacrifice of law enforcement officers at every level. At a time when officers are facing growing dangers in carrying out their duties, it is important that the House stand in unison to honor these brave men and women.

Lastly, the rule provides for consideration of the first appropriations bill for fiscal year 2027, H.R. 8469, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The bill provides robust funding for military housing, services for children and military members, and maintenance projects for military base facilities.

This legislation also takes care of our veterans by fully funding veterans' healthcare program benefits, and investing over \$2 billion in capital improvements for VA medical facilities and national cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8469 also bolsters our national security through continued investments for military bases and infrastructure for advanced weapons systems in places like the Indo-Pacific, where it is imperative that we strengthen our capabilities vis-a-vis China. As we heard in the Rules Committee last night, this appropriations bill, the MILCON-VA bill, passed unanimously, 58-0, out of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his remarks. I honor

our law enforcement officers, as does everybody on the Democratic side. Yet, as I look at the list of bills that Republicans are bringing to the floor this week, I have to say that the American people deserve way, way better than this.

I mean, Republicans love to talk about supporting the police, but talk is cheap. Look at what they do. There is not a single penny of public safety funding in any of these bills—not one.

I mean, these guys are more interested in passing press releases than they are in passing meaningful legislation that will make a real difference in our communities.

At the same time, Donald Trump's own budget—get this—calls for massive cuts to programs that support law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, go read it yourself. The President's budget cuts 55 percent from Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants. It cuts more than 60 percent from the COPS program, a program that Trump's own Justice Department calls the cornerstone of our Nation's crime-fighting strategy. I mean, how is this possible?

Let's not forget that mere hours after he was sworn in, on his very first day in office, President Trump pardoned the violent criminals who attacked police officers on January 6. Let me say that again in case anyone forgot. Donald Trump, on his first day in office, pardoned felons who viciously beat police officers at the Capitol Building.

Mr. Speaker, some of the people he pardoned have since gone on to do even more terrible things, including in my district, where one of them was just re-arrested on child pornography charges.

Don't come down to this Chamber and lecture people on law and order. The leader of the Republican Party wants to cut funding for public safety after he pardoned his own supporters who violently attacked police.

Talk is cheap around here. Look at what the radical, far-right people in charge of this government are doing. Look at how they vote. Look at their agenda for this week. Look at their priorities. This is another week without a single bill to make life more affordable and without a single bill to address the cost of living.

Why not? Well, the answer is simple: Republicans are not focused on your grocery bill. They are not focused on how much you pay at the pump. They are not focused on your rent, your healthcare, your utility bills, or your paycheck. They aren't focused on you.

They are focused on their obedience and obsession with Donald Trump, on his tariffs, his war, his billion-dollar ballroom, his arch, his reflecting pool paint job, and his golf course on the Potomac. Whatever he wants, they just say yes, and the rest of us pay the price for their radical MAGA extremism.

They ripped healthcare from millions of people in this country. They cut food assistance for kids, veterans, seniors,

and Americans with disabilities. They raised the price of everything from utilities to groceries. They did it all to give tax breaks to their billionaire donors and rubberstamp every dumb idea that President Trump comes up with.

Yesterday, the President said the quiet part out loud. He finally told the truth about something. When asked a simple question of whether he thinks about the terrible economic situation that he has put American families into, thanks to his illegal war, do you know what he said? "Not even a little bit."

Now, let that sink in. The President of the United States of America was asked if he cares how badly he screwed up your family's finances with his stupid, illegal war, and his answer was: "Not even a little bit."

Your gas is \$4.50 a gallon. He doesn't care, not even a little bit. Your pay isn't keeping up with inflation. He doesn't care, not even a little bit. Your health insurance is way up. He doesn't care, not even a little bit. Your fridge is empty until payday. He doesn't care, not even a little bit.

That is what he said. That is what he believes. That is how this radical, far-right majority in Congress is governing.

Those at the top are doing better than ever. The Epstein-class billionaires and special interests who write the campaign checks are doing great. They can't thank my Republican friends enough. Yet, the rest of us—for my constituents and for everyday people in this country—Donald Trump's economy sucks, and Republicans don't care, not even a little bit.

They tell themselves over and over again that everything is going well. Well, it is time for them to listen, to listen to the American people, who have had it up to here with these failed economic policies and who are sick and tired of a government that bends over backward to help those who are well-off and well-connected and turns a blind eye to the struggles of the working people in this country.

We have to do better. We have to do better.

Mr. Speaker, as we come together this week to honor our law enforcement officials, those who serve our communities and protect our communities, the least we could have done is brought a bill to the floor that would actually provide real help to our local police departments to be able to hire people and to be able to obtain the equipment that is necessary to protect our police officers.

Instead, we got a press release. We got a press release.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague with some interest. It sounds like he doesn't like the current occupant of the White House and has serious concerns about that, but it doesn't

sound like he dislikes any of the bills that much because he didn't spend much time talking about them.

That is what this rule is about—bringing those bills to the floor. In the MILCON-VA appropriations bill that passed out of the Appropriations Committee unanimously, I grant you, there were things in there that Democrats didn't like and things in there that Republicans didn't like. Yet, as we heard last night in the Rules Committee, the Appropriations Committee came together. They all had to compromise on certain things, but they got the bill done, and they felt like it was, overall, a good bill. There were certain disagreements, but overall, they felt like it was a good bill.

Then, we are doing some things, and they may want to do more, but we are doing some things that are very positive for law enforcement and for our local communities that will help communities be able to better figure out what is going on, whether it be bail or the monitoring system, et cetera.

That is what we are discussing here today. There is lots of time in the leadership hours and in the morning hour to give 1 minute, 5 minutes, or an hourlong speech. Yet, today, we are supposed to be discussing during this time period the rule that brings to the floor four bills that are good bills and an appropriations bill.

I am glad to hear that there is not a whole lot of consternation about the bills that we are presenting this rule on. While there may be disagreement on other items, I am glad that we are moving forward on that.

It is always tempting when you are here presenting a rule to get dragged into the cesspool or the thoughts that the other side wants to talk about, but that is what I am here to talk about: the bills that are in the rule that we are presenting today.

Apparently, they are pretty good. I know they don't like them 100 percent, but they must be pretty good, or they would have spent more time talking about them in the opening salvo of this debate on the rule. So, I think that should encourage all Members, both Democrats and Republicans, to vote for the rule.

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

□ 1240

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

I would just say to the gentleman there will be at least 5 hours of debate to talk about these less than impressive bills that he is bringing to the floor today. There will be even more debate on a handful of amendments that have been offered.

We are talking about the rule today, and the rule basically is Republicans' agenda for the week. It is not about lowering the price of groceries. It is not about dealing with the high price of gas. It is not about dealing with the rising costs of healthcare. Republicans'

agenda is to avoid talking about the real problems that Americans are facing as we gather here on the House floor.

I want to talk about your agenda, and your agenda sucks. I mean, I don't know how else to put it more plainly. It is a disgrace that my Republican friends spend more and more time trying to avoid dealing with the real issues that are hurting their constituents, but that is what their agenda is all about.

I get it. Everybody over there is afraid of the guy in the White House. Maybe you should be more afraid of your constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 7711, which would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is Police Week, and Republicans will come to the floor, as we have just heard, and talk about how much they support and honor our law enforcement officers. We all support law enforcement officers who keep us safe and protect our communities. But what most, if not all, of these Republicans will fail to do, and have failed to do repeatedly, is condemn the pardons that Donald Trump issued to over 1,500 individuals that attacked this building and attacked our democracy on January 6. Many of them were convicted of violent felonies.

For those who weren't here that day, go back and look at the videos, and you will see exactly what I am talking about. Over 140 brave Capitol Police, the ones in this Chamber now, the ones protecting all of us every single day were injured. Some tragically died.

What did this President do on his first day in office? He pardoned every last one of those violent offenders.

Now, these rioters outrageously are seeking tens of millions of dollars in damages, claiming that the indiscriminate use of force by police officers repelling the attack caused them physical and emotional injuries. Are you kidding me? I mean, where is the outrage on the Republican side over this? It is a disgrace.

If my Republican colleagues cannot denounce the actions of the President's supporters that day or condemn the pardons maybe—maybe, at least they will vote to ensure that these convicted felons aren't awarded millions of taxpayer dollars by the Trump administration as a reward for attacking police officers. I will give them a chance to do that with the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding time to me.

If we defeat the previous question, we will offer a bill, my bill, that will truly honor police officers: H.R. 7711, my No Rewards for January 6 Rioters Act.

On January 6, as we all know, violent rioters assaulted Capitol Police, beating them with flag poles, dragging them through crowds, and pepper spraying them in the face at point-blank range.

President Trump has not only called these criminals patriots, he decided January 6 insurrectionists deserved a blanket pardon for their attacks on police officers. It is shameful.

Now, the Trump administration is considering millions of dollars in payouts to these insurrectionists, which is a giant slap in the face to all the brave officers who fought to protect us—and our democracy on January 6.

My bill would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate any convicted January 6 rioter.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were serious about honoring police officers, they would take up my bill to prevent President Trump from paying off his favorite cop beaters.

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

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) said something last night about not having heard voices on our side of the aisle talking about the pardons, and Mr. SCOTT said: I did. I had a problem with it. That was Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT from Georgia.

I would remind the gentleman that he and I had a colloquy in the Rules Committee on February 4, 2025, on that same subject where I indicated that I had significant concerns about pardoning folks who had assaulted police officers.

It is not fair. That was something they pulled up because I am a member of the Rules Committee, and they brought it up in the Rules Committee meeting because I made a comment to the media in my home district. I am sure there are lots of other Republicans who have done the same, raised some concerns, raised some issues, and as a result, the White House came out with some explanations. People can choose to accept or not accept those explanations. It is what it is. But a number of us did raise concerns about that at the time.

Now, that being said, we have some bills before us today that are good bills. That is what we are supposed to be talking about.

We have got bills that deal with monitoring of courts. We have got bail bills that we are dealing with. There are a number of things. We have got a resolution that expresses Congress' support

for our law enforcement, which I think we are all in agreement on, and the gentleman said as much that we all support our local law enforcement and our law enforcement folks out there.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, let's look at these bills. That is what we are debating now is whether or not to bring these bills to the floor. I think all the bills that we presented should be brought to the floor. We can talk about other bills on another day, but these bills are appropriately before the House.

Then let's talk about the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies funding bill from Appropriations, which passed unanimously out of committee.

My colleague has indicated that we are offering a handful of amendments. Now, I have managed a couple of these rules before, and some of them have been closed. He consistently says: You haven't allowed any amendments, and now he depicts the amendments that we are allowing as a "handful." A majority of those—in fact, it is a supermajority of those that were theoretically in order, and it is 51.

Now, by my count, Mr. Speaker, that is 10 handfuls and a little bit more. It is not a handful of amendments. It is 10 handfuls. I would have to get a whole line of people here to hold on to all these amendments. We are going to hear debate on them, and we are going to have discussion about it.

So it gives you some idea of the hyperbole that my friends on the other side of the aisle are using when you take 51 amendments and depict them as a mere handful.

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

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

You have got to love these guys. I remind everybody, especially those who may be watching this on TV, that four out of the five bills that we are considering today are under completely closed rules, number one.

Number two, I appreciate the gentleman expressing some concern about what happened on January 6. He said that some of them, you know, expressed their concern about the President's pardon publicly, so I just kind of Googled what my colleague from Virginia said to his local newspaper. He said that he has mixed feelings about President Trump pardoning those who were charged in connection with the January 6 attack on the Capitol.

I don't know what "mixed feelings" means, but if my friend were genuinely outraged by what happened that day and by the pardoning of these people who violently attacked the police officers that were defending us that day, then I guess my question to the gentleman would be: Then why did you vote consistently against hanging a plaque honoring those police officers who protected our lives that day?

□ 1250

Again, I find the silence on the other side of the aisle not only in regard to

what happened in this Chamber on January 6—I find it particularly disturbing—but the silence in the aftermath of Donald Trump pardoning all of these criminals.

Again, we have police officers who were severely wounded. Some ended up losing their lives. I mean, if you have objections and you have concerns, and even if you have mixed feelings, whatever that means, about the President pardoning all of these people, then does that mean that the gentleman will support our amendment that we are bringing up here that would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021?

I mean, I am not going to hold my breath, but I am willing to bet that virtually every Republican, if not every Republican, will vote against this amendment.

Again, we get a lot of lectures about law and order from Republicans. Let's not forget, again, the leader of their party, the President of the United States, pardoned over 1,500 of his own supporters who violently attacked this building, including pardons for hundreds of convicted felons who violently and viciously beat law enforcement officers on January 6, sending many of them to the hospital with serious injuries.

Donald Trump pardoned every single one of them. Many are repeat offenders who are now back in our communities because of the radical, far-right policies of this President and because of the acquiescence and the silence of the party that controls this Chamber.

I mean, Matthew Huttel, a man with 12 prior criminal convictions, including a shocking case where he pled guilty to brutally hitting his 3-year-old son, leaving bruises all over his child's backside and neck, after he was pardoned by Donald Trump for the crimes he committed on January 6, went back to Indiana, where he was killed during a violent confrontation with law enforcement. He was a child abuser with a history of violence, who put law enforcement in danger again after he was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Theodore Middendorf, accused of sexually assaulting a 7-year-old child—this guy pled guilty to this horrific crime in 2024, and he was sentenced to 19 years in prison. That wasn't all. He also pled guilty to destroying government property and using an American flagpole as a weapon during the Capitol riot. He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Peter Schwartz, a man with 30 prior criminal convictions, including abusing and assaulting his wife, biting her and repeatedly punching her, was convicted of attacking police officers on January 6 with pepper spray. He is another repeat offender pardoned by Donald Trump.

Andrew Taake was arrested in 2016 for soliciting a minor online for sex, but his criminal history didn't stop

there. He assaulted police officers with bear spray and a metal whip on January 6. He is another repeat offender pardoned by Donald Trump.

Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress are complicit in these crimes. I mean, thanks to these pardons, we have child sex predators and violent criminals back on our streets. We even have January 6 perpetrators who have been rearrested on new charges after being pardoned.

Daniel Ball, a convicted felon because of his involvement in the Capitol insurrection, was pardoned by Trump on January 20, only to be rearrested 2 days later on gun charges.

How dare you guys come down here and talk about law and order when you are complicit in these crimes? How dare you come down here and talk about supporting the police after you let out violent criminals who attacked law enforcement officers on January 6?

I mean, I get it. We have different opinions on a lot of issues, but the one thing that should unite us is our praise and our respect for those who defended not only all of us who were here on January 6 but also defended our democracy.

Because the guy in the White House doesn't want anybody to acknowledge that that was a terrible day, everybody just caved. Everybody caves on the other side.

I don't have any mixed feelings about what Trump did. I think it was outrageous. I think most Americans that I talk to, and I think most Americans across this country, don't have mixed feelings. They think what happened that day was outrageous. These guys should not have been pardoned. Some of them should still be in jail.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If I am to be pilloried on the floor of the United States House, let us get the facts correct.

First, I am sure that WJHL, a television station, would not appreciate being called a newspaper. Second, let me read you the first quote.

Griffith: "I have mixed feelings. I personally think that some of those folks who assaulted police officers deserve some of the time they got." If I am to be pilloried, there is what I said.

The following week, in the Rules Committee, in response to questions from my colleague, I responded that I did not have every case in front of me, speaking of pardons. It is a difficult decision, and I would have had a hard time pardoning people who assaulted police officers on any occasion.

If I am to be pilloried, let's get the record straight, and I think the same would be true for many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

Let's talk about violent criminals because we have a bill in front of us today that will deal with that. We have the charitable—the phraseology is the "charitable bail funds." We have a bill

in front of us that will treat them as insurance.

Now, people may think at home, if they are watching this, what in the world do bail bonds have to do with insurance? Well, having been a criminal defense attorney, I can assure you that the insurance is to ensure that people show up for their court dates, and that is what bonds are for.

If you put up a bond, an insurance company usually writes that. If it is a corporate surety bond, that is usually what you have. Sometimes, you have property bonds, and there are other ways of doing it. If you have a corporate surety bond or a group comes forward and puts the money up for you, that group ensures that you will be present in court, or you forfeit the amount that you have put forward.

That is all fine and good. We have charitable groups out there, and they are looking at cases where you have people who can't afford it, but it is not a violent crime or something where there is a danger to the public. I understand that. That is what the bill does. It says we are going to treat them like they are insurance companies because they are, in fact, stepping into the shoes of an insurance company.

It is not grandma who is putting up her house, which many of my clients had their grandmas put up their houses to guarantee they would be present in court when they were supposed to be there to be tried for their offenses. They are acting like those corporate surety bonds. They are stepping into those shoes, and they ought to be treated accordingly under the law.

Then, we heard a whole litany—and I really didn't want to get into it—a whole litany of things that people did who were doing bad things on January 6 and did some bad things afterward, as well. I point out also that that is not before us at this very minute. What is before us is a bill on these charity bonds and cashless bonds.

When people are released on cashless bonds or artificially low bail, they have a greater propensity to reoffend, as I said in my opening. Because I feel compelled, for example, in Wisconsin, Darrell Brooks was released on a \$1,000 bond after running over a woman with a vehicle, despite a lengthy criminal history and an additional outstanding warrant.

Brooks was previously charged with aggravated battery and had an outstanding warrant in Nevada after skipping bail for a sex-related crime. Then, on November 21, 2021, Brooks drove through a Christmas parade, injuring over 50 individuals, killing 6, 1 of whom was an 8-year-old child.

A March 2023 study, which I mentioned before, by researchers at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, found that approximately 72 percent of violent felony offenders who were released without bail were rearrested.

We could stand here and go through hours of this, but, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a good number of bills

that deal with trying to make our communities a little bit safer, giving people more information, and trying to make sure we are getting it right, trying to help our police officers and our local communities be safer.

These are all good bills. They may not do everything that everybody wants, but these bills before us and this rule that we are presenting are good bills. Then, we have the MILCON-VA bill, which passed out of the Appropriations Committee unanimously, 58-0.

□ 1300

I believe that we should pass these bills. The first step in doing that is passing the rule so we can bring the bills to the floor with set time for debate. There will be plenty of time for debate. There will be time on the MILCON-VA bill to go over amendments and to then consider as a House, as the House for the United States, whether or not we want to pass them. I think we should.

The first step is we have got to pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to all vote “yes” to bring these bills to the floor. My colleagues on the other side can debate whatever deficiencies they may see in the bills and have their time to tell the American people about those bills.

I really wish they would focus, when we are talking about a rule, on the rule to bring the bills to the floor and not all these other matters. I understand they want to talk about other things. I get it. That is the role of the minority. However, Mr. Speaker, as the majority, we need to pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I advise that whenever my colleagues are ready, I am prepared to close. I urge my colleagues to pass this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me apologize to the TV station that I called a newspaper. What a terrible sin. I appreciate the gentleman’s clarity in reading that I have mixed feelings because some of the people deserve some of the time. Boy, that is really a strongly worded condemnation.

I want to disagree with the gentleman on one thing he said, and that is somehow this is not on the agenda today. The gentleman just read off what the Republican agenda was and the votes that the Republicans want us to consider on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question.

Our staff handed my friend’s team the amendment that we want to vote on. The next vote that we have, by the way, will be on whether we would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. I guess that is the next vote. So people are going to have to

vote “yes” or “no” on that, and it is in front of us.

I don’t really understand why the gentleman would say that it is not in front of us. If he wants to support what we are trying to do here and make sure that the people who viciously attacked Capitol Police officers on that day on January 6 that threatened the lives of those who work here and who destroyed all of this property, that is well-documented, all of this is on video, I am happy to yield to the gentleman if he would like to endorse what we are trying to do so maybe we can agree on something.

Okay, well, I guess I am not going to get that support.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the next vote, again, I remind people, will be on whether or not we want to prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.

The President is hinting that maybe he would be favorable to compensating some of these people who are responsible for the terrible crimes on that day. I find that sickening, quite frankly. He wants to give money to criminals, the people who attacked our democracy, who beat up our police officers, and yet he doesn’t want to give money to our police officers, as I pointed out in the beginning. There is not a penny contained in any of these bills that actually help support our local police officers.

Let me also bring us back to what I think this debate is all about. It is about priorities. This is another wasted week, and the debate is really about what Republicans are not doing and what they refuse to do. It is about their wasted time in the majority and their total failure to bring up legislation to help everyday people.

People are begging us. They are begging us to do something about inflation. They are pleading with us to bring grocery prices down, to lower gas prices, to make life more affordable, and to stop the war and reverse the tariffs that are eating into their paychecks and killing their finances.

What do Republicans prioritize week after week after week after week?

It is billionaire tax breaks, loopholes for the rich and powerful, giveaways to the giant corporations, the price gougers, and the big donors who line their pockets with campaign cash.

Listen to me, America: These guys promised to lower your prices on day one. It is year two for God’s sake, and who are you going to believe, them or your empty wallet?

Republicans have done nothing—nothing—to lower your costs. Their agenda does nothing to help everyday people. Their bills do nothing for working families. Their leader said so on TV yesterday.

He doesn’t even think about how his reckless, illegal, vanity war hurts your pocketbook. He thinks about his arch.

He thinks about painting the reflecting pool. He thinks about his golf course on the Potomac River. He thinks about bailouts for foreign governments and corrupt, shady deals that enrich his inner circle.

He thinks about his ballroom. Boy, does he bring that up every day. He wants \$1 billion of your money for his tacky ballroom.

However, when it comes to helping you, when it comes to helping your family, when it comes to the medical bills piling up on your kitchen table, and when it comes to figuring out how to keep your fridge full until your next paycheck, he told us the answer himself: He doesn’t care, not even a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the MILCON-VA bill. For folks watching at home, I will translate: military construction at our bases and Veterans Affairs, which is our VA hospitals, et cetera. That is what this rule has in it. It also has a number of bills related to law enforcement making things better: the monitoring systems, the bail systems, cashless bonds, et cetera.

These are good bills, and the rule ought to be passed, as I said before.

I would be remiss if I didn’t speak about the fact that this is Police Week. It is one of the reasons why we have these bills and others in front of us.

This year, unfortunately, and it has happened before since I have been in office, an officer was killed in the Ninth Congressional District. Officer Hall was killed in an inmate attack at the River North Correctional Center in Independence, Virginia, which is in Grayson County in November of last year.

Two additional officers were attacked at that time. Both are physically doing okay, but, Mr. Speaker, I don’t know how you ever get over an act of violence where you witnessed a colleague, a friend, a brother in law enforcement, being murdered.

That is really what we are about this week, and this rule promotes four bills that will help. It doesn’t solve everything. It doesn’t resolve everything. Jeremy Hall will be remembered in another resolution coming up this week that we will be voting on to honor fallen law enforcement officers.

We can also honor them all by taking these steps forward in trying to make our system better and recognizing that we probably ought not let violent felons, people who have already committed crimes, out on either no bond or low bond. We probably ought to make sure that the folks posting the bonds are capable and available to actually ensure the presence of the defendant at trial.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I left this out earlier, and I apologize. It is a big part of the bail system. It is also to ensure their good behavior while out on bond. It is both presence on the court date and good behavior between the time the bond is posted and the time of that court date.

What the data shows us is that without one of these bills, there is an increase from 62 percent to 72 percent of recidivism. That helps our police officers and honors those who have been wounded, physically or psychologically, while serving in law enforcement, and those who answered the last call, like Officer Hall.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will vote to put this rule forward. I urge the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1275 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7711) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7711.

SEC. 12. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 7711 no later than three calendar days after passage.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING THAT SECTION 11 OF
HOUSE RESOLUTION 1224 SHALL
HAVE NO FORCE OR EFFECT

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 1274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1274

Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is simple. Two weeks ago, the Rules Committee met to provide for consideration of the farm bill, H.R. 7567, in addition to H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.

Nothing in this rule changes that. Instead, the rule before us makes a procedural change, which will allow H.R. 1346 and the farm bill, both, to be transmitted to the Senate separately for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1346. For too long, the people of western Minnesota, along with families and farmers across the entire country, have been subjected to frustrating, outdated, and unnecessary regulations.

Currently, our growers are subjected to patchwork regulations that effectively ban the sale of E15 during the summer months. The summer ban is a direct hit to the American taxpayer. It limits consumer choice, drives up prices at the pump during the height of the summer travel season, and restricts the market for homegrown biofuels.

Because of these antiquated rules, farmers have been forced to rely on temporary, short-term emergency waivers that create confusion rather than progress.

The legislation before us today changes that. It includes text for permanent, year-round E15 to finally provide the certainty that our agriculture and energy sectors deserve. We are moving past the era of temporary fixes and toward a future of long-term stability.

The benefits of E15 are clear and backed by significant data. First, this is a major win for American consumers. E15 is a lower cost fuel option, typically priced 20 to 40 cents per gallon less than regular unleaded gasoline.

In a time of fluctuating global energy markets, providing this relief is a ne-

cessity for hardworking Americans. In fact, E15 adoption would save American drivers an estimated \$27 billion a year on gas purchases, putting roughly \$200 back into the pocket of the average American household annually.

Second, this is a win for our national security and energy independence. Ethanol is produced within American borders by American workers. Every gallon we blend is a gallon of oil we do not need to import from foreign countries.

By leaning into domestic production, we are strengthening our energy independence and reinforcing our commitment to American-made energy.

The American people understand this. Eighty percent of citizens believe renewable fuels, like ethanol, are necessary for our energy independence, and 71 percent support increasing the availability of E15 to help lower prices.

Year-round E15 is a massive win for the American farmer. In western Minnesota, our corn growers are large supporters of the biofuels industry. They deserve a fair and consistent market for their product.

Full adoption of E15 would increase corn consumption by 2.4 billion bushels, supporting our rural communities and ensuring steady, predictable demand year-round.

Beyond the farm, the economic impact is staggering. Full E15 adoption would add \$25.8 billion to the U.S. GDP and support an additional 128,000 full-time jobs.

Beyond the economic and agricultural benefits, H.R. 1346 provides essential regulatory and market certainty. It enhances fuel supply chain stability and improves certainty for the entire fuel industry by eliminating unfair advantages for some refineries over others.

By reforming the small refinery exemption process, this bill helps the Environmental Protection Agency set renewable fuel standard annual volumes in a timely, transparent, and fair manner. It removes the reoccurring tension between refiners and agricultural stakeholders, allowing everyone from farmers to fuel retailers to better plan for the future.

It is important to address the technical advancements of vehicles since the current regulations were created.

□ 1320

E15 is legally approved for all vehicles built since 2001 or later, which accounts for more than 96 percent of the cars on the road today. Furthermore, E15 burns cleaner and reduces emissions that harm our health and our environment.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to keep hitting the pause button on American energy every summer. This legislation removes the hurdles that have stifled E15 for decades. It gives farmers the confidence they need to plan, and it gives consumers a lower-cost option when they need it most.

The American people are calling for solutions. This bill provides more