

Mr. MESSMER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that farmers are facing high input costs and that commodity prices are too low. Today, I stand here in support of a policy that will bring about a sustainable solution.

The Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act is not an agriculture assistance package. It is not a mandate. Retailers have a choice. It is not an emergency payment.

This bill delivers cost savings at the pump for U.S. consumers with a promise of stability for small refiners and guaranteed profitability for the next generation of American farmers.

Don't just take it from me. Consider the appeal from hundreds of companies, manufacturers, and producer cooperatives that are pleading for this program.

The hardworking American farmer deserves certainty, and this bill delivers just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in investing in America's farm families, in agricultural businesses, and in our beloved rural communities by supporting this important legislation.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN).

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today, we have the opportunity to save every American at the pump up to 50 cents per gallon. We know because we have proved it right in my home State of Iowa. The value of yearlong, nationwide E15 is real money in the pockets of families, communities, and our supply chain nationwide.

Today, we get to choose if we save every American family those dollars and put it back in their pockets to reinvest in their families when they fill up, or if we are going to continue to allow energy prices to strain families' budgets.

Today, we get to choose between a fuel that is grown literally right here in the United States for energy independence, or if we continue to be reliant on foreign powers and adversaries, subsidizing their ability to get fuel to the rest of the world while America does the heavy lifting.

Today, we get the chance to deliver for producers, family farmers like the 87,000 small family farmers that are building that next generation of not only feeding our country but also fueling it.

Our farmers work hard for our families. Today, we get to work hard for both families and farmers by putting this bill on the floor, the first time E15 has ever been voted on.

We defeated backroom deals in D.C. to secure this vote that will bring down costs for American families. Now, we have the chance today to finish that job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle—this is an opportunity for affordability for families,

certainty for producers, and American energy that grows right here in America. I ask for their support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my support for the Renewable Fuel Standard, including allowing the voluntary year-round sale of gasoline with 15 percent ethanol, known as E15, because it lowers prices for American drivers, supports farmers, and fosters investment in cleaner transportation fuel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to support this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1650

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1346, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSMER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, 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 announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1346) to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PERRY. 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 are postponed.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1275, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) expressing support for law enforcement officers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 96

Whereas the brave men and women in law enforcement work tirelessly and relentlessly to safeguard the communities they are sworn to protect, serving as the backbone of public safety across our Nation;

Whereas law enforcement officers bear the critical responsibility of upholding the rule of law and maintaining the safety, stability, and public order upon which our communities depend;

Whereas law enforcement officers routinely and selflessly risk their own lives and safety to combat crime, remove dangerous and lethal drugs from our streets, and stand in defense of the most vulnerable among us;

Whereas law enforcement officers strengthen our communities through outreach, mentorship, crisis response, and countless daily acts of service that frequently go unrecognized;

Whereas, from resolving neighborhood disputes to checking in on elderly residents and guiding youth programs, officers provide a quiet and steady presence that extends far beyond traditional law enforcement duties;

Whereas rhetoric and policies from leftist activists and progressive politicians seek to defund or dismantle local police departments undermine public safety and place both officers and the communities they serve at greater risk;

Whereas sanctuary city policies that restrict cooperation with Federal immigration authorities can compel local law enforcement agencies to divert already limited resources and actively encourage resentment toward local law enforcement;

Whereas the Trump administration's focus on restoring law and order has contributed to a notable decline in homicide rates, with levels reaching among the lowest recorded in over a century;

Whereas drug overdose deaths in the United States have declined significantly, reaching their lowest levels since 2019;

Whereas violent crime rates have declined significantly in major cities across the United States; and

Whereas law enforcement officers deserve our deepest respect, unwavering support, and profound gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) appreciates and values the indispensable contributions that law enforcement provides to our communities and our country each and every day;

(2) recognizes the extraordinary sacrifice that law enforcement officers make to protect and serve their communities and their country; and

(3) expresses its profound and wholehearted support for the men and women of law enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. 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. Con. Res. 96.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a great deal of gratitude to the men and women in law enforcement who make sacrifices every day. They miss dinners, holidays, parent-teacher conferences, sports games, performances, and celebrations with their families so that the rest of us can live safely. These brave officers are the thin blue line that stand between our communities and chaos.

For years, radical Democrats championed the defund the police movement, slashed police budgets, and demonized entire police departments while crimes skyrocketed. Murders, carjackings, and retail thefts surged. We also saw leftist rogue prosecutors utterly fail to enforce the laws and uphold their oath of office. They refused to prosecute entire categories of crime, implemented cashless bail, released violent offenders back into society, and the list goes on and on.

We have seen Democrats support sanctuary city policies and openly side with illegal immigrants over American citizens. Sanctuary jurisdictions proudly shield criminal aliens from Federal immigration authorities, regardless of the cost to the residents. Officials from these jurisdictions tie the hands of their very own police departments. We have seen time and again how these jurisdictions refuse to honor an ICE detainer, release a criminal alien back onto the streets, and then that alien commits another heinous crime. Almost one-third of the country lives in a sanctuary jurisdiction. That is roughly 100 million Americans.

Where these failed policies took hold, chaos followed. Thankfully, the Trump administration has restored law and order. Because of President Trump, the border is secure.

Because of President Trump, the homicide rate has declined an average of 21 percent in 35 major U.S. cities, reaching the lowest level recorded in over a century.

Because of President Trump, we have seen the lowest number of drug overdoses since 2019.

These historic results prove that when we enforce the law and prioritize prosecuting violent crime, American communities become safer for everyone. When law enforcement officers are empowered to do their jobs, American communities become safer for everyone. When politicians support the police instead of siding with radical activists, American communities become safer for everyone.

To every police officer watching today, America sees you. We thank you. We stand with you.

I urge my colleagues to support our brave men and women in law enforcement, reject policies that make Americans less safe, and support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose and to deplore this partisan resolution. As you just heard, H. Con. Res. 96 is another tiresome and loathsome exercise in partisan MAGA polemics.

Unlike H. Res. 1252, which was honestly written to honor law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty, and which received an overwhelming bipartisan vote in the House just a few hours ago, this nonbinding rhetorical resolution desecrates the solemnity and abandons the nonpartisanship of Police Week by scrawling a bunch of false and inflammatory anti-Democratic and pro-Trump graffiti on what has always been, until now, a simple nonpartisan resolution expressing the national consensus supporting law enforcement.

It is not difficult to write these resolutions in a way that garners widespread bipartisan support. Last year, Congress passed H. Con. Res. 30, a bipartisan resolution expressing our mutual common support for local law enforcement. The year before that, together we passed H. Res. 1213, condemning calls to defund the police and violence against law enforcement officers.

We have always strived for bipartisanship in these resolutions on Police Week to show that the whole community is together. But just as 21 Republicans voted against the Congressional Gold Medal for officers who defended this Capitol and this Chamber against rioters and insurrectionists on January 6, 2021, now, the Republicans bring forward a resolution designed not to unify but to divide.

The resolution before us invites us to endorse a tired, false, cliché-ridden partisan claim about defunding the police when, in fact, it is Democrats who have repeatedly promoted robust funding for law enforcement, while congressional Republicans, the Trump administration, and Elon Musk have cut funding for law enforcement and public safety programs that actually work as they slashed \$500 million from State and local crime-fighting and victim assistance grants and programs under the DOGE and Elon Musk's crusade against the Federal Government.

The resolution also invites us to sign on to the demonstrably false claim that the Trump administration's focus on restoring law and order has contributed to a notable decline in homicide rates. The significant decline in violent crime in major cities over the past couple of years has nothing to do with the Trump Presidency as the resolution asserts and everything to do with the

Democrats they denounce and the Biden Presidency's investment in State and local law enforcement.

In fact, homicides skyrocketed during the first Trump administration, and the historic nationwide decrease in violent crime began during the Biden administration and was the result of Democratic-led investments in public safety through both the American Rescue Plan, which House Republicans unanimously opposed, and the historic Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Thanks to these sweeping investments in public safety and our common security, cities leveraged Federal funds and innovation to pursue a variety of effective programs to combat violent crime, with some cities recording the lowest murder rate since the 1960s, or even before that.

□ 1700

Madam Speaker, instead of restoring law and order, as the resolution claims, the current administration has systematically undermined law enforcement and jeopardized public safety without any objections from the party that claims to back the blue. The administration canceled millions in critical grant funding that supported State and local law enforcement. It reassigned more than 25,000 Federal agents tasked with fighting organized crime, terrorism, and human trafficking away from their missions in order to do immigration roundups.

The administration invaded American cities with a lawless paramilitary force, unleashing chaos and deadly violence on U.S. citizens, like Renee Good and Alex Pretti, under the pretense of fighting the worst of the worst. The administration stopped enforcing the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, announced that in its first week in office.

It fired dozens of experienced Justice Department lawyers and FBI agents just because they participated in the largest criminal investigation and prosecution in American history against the people who attacked this Chamber and the Capitol and the Congress and the Vice President on January 6, 2021.

This administration has also pardoned dozens of white-collar criminals and fraudsters, including the former President of Honduras, Juan Orlando Hernandez, an international narco-trafficker who brought 800,000 pounds of cocaine into America, saying he would shove it up the noses of the gringos, and he was going off to jail for decades when President Trump decided to pardon him for reasons unknown.

He has released people from prison from January 6 who went on to commit serious new crimes against our people, such as Mr. Johnson who got out because of his Trump pardon and went on and sexually assaulted two 12-year-old children and now has been sentenced to life in prison because of that. Those kids' lives have been irrevocably altered by the mass pardon of all of these people that included armed robbers,

violent felons, domestic abusers, you name it, and a lot of them are back at it right now.

Madam Speaker, the administration has repeatedly threatened to cut off funding for State and local law enforcement in numerous jurisdictions and attempted to commandeer State and local police officers and resources to do the Federal Government's job at State and local expense. All of this compromises public safety and is an insult to the officers who work to keep us safe.

Republicans in Congress have done nothing to put the brakes on Donald Trump's weak-on-crime agenda, and we were going to give him a chance. The fact that he has 34 Federal criminal counts that he is convicted of himself doesn't mean he had to be soft on crime, but he is soft on crime, and we are not going to help the Republicans pull the wool over America's eyes. We are not going to do that to salvage their leader who is sinking like a stone in public opinion polls for his illegal tariffs, his unconstitutional war, his soaring inflation, and runaway corruption throughout the government.

Donald Trump has a staph infection, and America can see it every day. House Republican appropriators recently rejected the Trump administration's proposal to increase ATF's budget by 4 percent and agent head count from 2,400 to 3,000 agents in the coming fiscal year. Instead, they want to cut ATF's budget by \$285 million, which would leave ATF with even fewer resources to support State and local police as they work to prevent and investigate and prosecute gun crimes.

Meaningless polemics against leftist activists and progressive politicians have no place in a resolution purportedly meant to honor law enforcement. This is the first time that any majority has fallen into the political trap, but they can't help themselves because they are so desperate because of the plummeting poll numbers of Donald Trump and his administration.

Now that you raise it, it is worth noting that Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee have actually voted to defund the police in the 119th Congress. H.R. 7640, the Shut Down Sanctuary Policies Act of 2026, would strip Federal funding from jurisdictions that have laws placing any limits on State and local law enforcement officers' involvement in Federal immigration matters despite the fact that immigration enforcement is the job of the Federal Government and not an unfunded mandate that can be put on the States and cities and localities.

All of this undermines public safety. I cannot support this resolution, which lies about Republicans and this administration's real record on crime and public safety. The observance of National Police Week and Peace Officers Memorial Day marks a time of solemn remembrance when our Nation should come together to honor the courage, sacrifice, and dedication of our law en-

forcement officers and personnel, and promote awareness of their service to our communities.

Let's stand united and reject this shameful effort to inject divisive partisan politics into this resolution and this week.

If you want something that can bring us together, please support the bill that I introduced today to create a fund to compensate the law enforcement officers who defended the Republic, this Capitol, the Congress, the Vice President against that violent attack on January 6, 2021. They continue to suffer the physical, medical, psychological effects of that atrocious attack.

The Trump administration wrote a check for nearly \$5 million to the family of Ashli Babbitt despite the fact that there were two different investigations which determined that the police had acted reasonably, lawfully, and honorably. Yet, they just gave them a check for \$5 million.

What do the families of the officers who defended our lives get? So far they have done nothing. We are introducing legislation to make that happen, and I hope everybody in this body who really believes that law enforcement should be stood by and should be defended in their work will get with us on this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, you know, when I hear the term "national consensus," what seems to be national consensus is that the Democrats were the ones that promoted defund the police. I have here a list of cities who cut a total of \$1.71 billion to promote police. They did that because they wanted to defund the police.

I hear that there is a consensus bill. The Democrats couldn't even get a unanimous vote on the bill we just voted on just an hour or so ago. I mean, it is just hokum. It is just flat out hokum.

Well, the national consensus is that Democrats are well-known to have supported the defund the police movement.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BIGGS for helping us bring this resolution forward.

Today, I rise for National Police Week where thousands of officers and their families are in Washington, D.C., right now for memorial services, honoring the men and women who have given everything in the line of duty.

I will start by honoring one of those Iowans, our own, who lost his life while serving in my community. Officer Phoukham Tran was with the Des Moines Police Department, and he lost

his life when he was hit while serving in the line of duty by a drunk driver outside of the Iowa State Fair. He served for more than three decades with the Des Moines Police Department. And while he succumbed to his injuries, his legacy of service for our community made us all recognize how much safer we are based on what he did for all of us.

He is only 1 of 198 officers honored at the Iowa Peace Officers Memorial in downtown Des Moines, sacrificing their lives for a safer community, and this week we honor all of those losses, and we remember each of those families, and our communities are better because of what they did for us.

These are the heroes that we recognize this week. This is their resolution, and that is what this is about. The officers who sacrificed their lives in the line of duty are the loved ones who have served, as well as the loved ones who are left behind, and the officers who continue serving our communities every day despite the loss of a friend, a comrade, and a wingman.

Unfortunately, there is a reality, as Mr. BIGGS has stated, that some elected officials, including some here in Congress and across this country, have refused to honor or even recognize their sacrifice and service by standing with our law enforcement.

Whether it is the radical idea of defunding the police or the self-described sanctuary cities, these policies are a choice, a choice that undermines the very communities they are serving, a choice that puts officer safety at risk every single day.

□ 1710

I am proud to say that my State of Iowa has resoundingly rejected these policies. In Iowa, we led the Back the Blue Act that increased penalties for violent crimes, particularly those against officers, and increased law enforcement pay. That is truly how you stand with law enforcement.

We also banned sanctuary policies back in 2018.

Just last year, Iowa increased penalties for assaulting a law enforcement officer, including a mandatory minimum for a violent offense.

These policies in Iowa have led to a historic decline in crime. As noted, we now have the lowest homicide rate in over 125 years. Fewer murders are good for every American.

Iowa has made its position clear, and now Congress has the opportunity to do the same. The good work being done on the Judiciary Committee is executing on exactly that.

Last year alone, sanctuary city jurisdictions declined almost 18,000 ICE detainer requests, many against violent offenders and habitual offenders who were turned back onto the streets. Nearly 18,000 times, local officials chose not to allow the police to cooperate with Federal law enforcement and released these individuals back into the communities, making not only

local officers' jobs harder but those at the Federal level, as well.

I know this much is true: When we support local law enforcement, it works, and we have proven it. Homicide rates are the lowest in over a century. Drug overdose deaths are at their lowest in over a decade. Federal law enforcement is working alongside departments in States like Iowa and so many others to remove real public safety threats.

That happens when we stand with law enforcement. That is what this week is about: honoring those who have fallen, those who continue to serve, and the communities that stand with our men and women on that thin blue line.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), who is the ranking member of the Crime and Federal Government Surveillance Subcommittee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for giving me time to speak on the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 96, which does a disservice to our law enforcement officers by using them simply in a political ploy.

This resolution takes cheap shots and spreads misinformation while not doing a single thing to help law enforcement or improve public safety, which should be our goal this and every National Police Week.

I will not repeat the misleading statements and half-truths in this resolution, but I will actually present some facts today.

It is a fact that it was the first Trump administration when our country experienced the largest increase in homicides ever recorded in a single year.

It is a fact that violent crimes, especially homicides, have been declining for nearly 4 years, beginning under the Biden administration, long before this administration took office.

It is a fact that this historic, yearslong effort to decrease crime began under a Democratic President and Democratic control of Congress, which allowed us to pass unprecedented investments in law enforcement and public safety through the American Rescue Plan Act and the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

It is a fact that cities and States across the country, many of them led by Democratic mayors and Democratic Governors, used that funding to strengthen their approach to public safety by investing in their local law enforcement, but also in education, community centers, community violence intervention, social workers, mental health and substance abuse services, and more.

It is a fact that these efforts to improve public safety have allowed many

cities to achieve the fewest murders since the 1960s or even earlier.

It is a fact that the Trump administration has repeatedly eliminated funding for public safety programs that we know work, including clawing back \$500 million in public safety grants that were already awarded.

On top of that, the Trump administration has diverted more than 25,000 law enforcement officers to immigration enforcement and away from their jobs of investigating gun violence, drug trafficking, sex crimes, and other major offenses, leading criminal prosecutions to fall to their lowest points in decades.

This resolution does not invest a single dollar in effective policing. It does not equip police with modern technology to help them simply solve a crime. It does not invest in innovative, collaborative approaches to public safety. It does not provide assistance to help law enforcement agencies address the continuing crisis that they are facing in the recruitment and retention of law enforcement officers. It does not do anything to make our police officers safer on the job and more likely to return home to their families safe and sound at the end of their shifts.

That is what we should be doing here in the House during National Police Week. When Democrats controlled the House, that is exactly what we did. We passed bipartisan bills that were signed into law and are still improving law enforcement officer safety and wellness, and strengthening public safety. These bills include the Protecting America's First Responders Act, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, the COPS Counseling Act, and the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act.

Make no mistake, my opposition to this resolution is not opposition to the statements in this resolution that we can all agree on, such as that our law enforcement officers work tirelessly to protect our communities. Indeed, I was proud to vote in favor of the bipartisan resolution that we actually passed today in support of law enforcement and honoring those who died while serving their communities, including my own.

Yet, I must oppose this legislation that seeks to score political points instead of investing in law enforcement and in our communities.

Madam Speaker, as the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government Surveillance, I urge my colleagues to stand with me in opposing this resolution and to instead work with me on bills that will actually support law enforcement and improve public safety.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is interesting to think back on 2020 as being the measuring line that you are coming from because, when you remember, that is

the year of George Floyd. That is the year of CHAZ, CHOP, and rioting, wholesale violence, the Portland courthouse under siege, and the defund police movement, even by some across the aisle in Congress.

What has happened since President Trump has come in? Violent crime rates have declined significantly in major cities across the United States. That is what this resolution says at one point. Let's get here.

Do they deny the drop? No, they don't deny the drop. They just don't like the fact that Donald Trump gets some credit for it. The TDS has been on display.

The numbers are clear. Why does falling crime under renewed law and order priorities threaten the worldview of Democrats? It shouldn't.

In Chicago, for instance, in 2025, homicides plunged 29 percent after Donald Trump was elected, from 587 in 2024 to 417 last year.

In Columbus, Ohio, in the same period, rapes dropped 39 percent, from 1,116 down to 678.

In Houston, ag assaults fell 17 percent, from 18,590 to 15,378.

Robberies in L.A. dropped 15.3 percent, from 8,593 to 7,278.

New York City recorded the fewest shooting victims and shooting incidents in its entire recorded history in 2025.

Democrats spent years telling us that backing the police, enforcing laws, and rejecting soft-on-crime nonsense wouldn't work, that it was racist, outdated, or somehow made things worse. Yet, the American people can see the results with their own eyes—safer streets, fewer victims. That is what is specifically stated in this resolution.

What don't they like about it? It mentions Donald J. Trump. It is that simple. They should be coming along with us.

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

□ 1720

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

The worst Congress in modern American history cannot even write a resolution praising law enforcement that maintains bipartisan support—something that every other Congress, Democratic or Republican, has been able to do—because they are so desperate to cover up their miserable record.

The Trump administration has done nothing more to improve public safety than it has done to lower the ruinous inflation they unleashed on us with their illegal tariffs or to open up the Strait of Hormuz, which was closed only because of the illegal war Trump has already spent \$29 billion of our money on.

Well, our colleagues have some very fine rhetoric about how much they love public safety. So why don't we look at their fiscal year 2027 budget proposal. They won't fess up to the fact that

they just slashed \$500 million out of local and State crime fighting and victim assistance grants, but let's talk about the future.

Well, what does their fiscal year 2027 budget proposal say? It proposes significant funding cuts for grant programs under the Office on Violence Against Women, including a \$14 million cut to transitional housing grants and a \$15 million cut to legal assistance grants to help survivors and their children.

They want to cut 62.1 percent, nearly a half a billion dollars from the discretionary budget request for COPS, which would translate into complete elimination of the anti-methamphetamine task forces, the anti-heroin task forces, the Community Policing Development Project, de-escalation training, and the dramatic reduction in STOP School Violence, and other crime-fighting projects.

So you are talking about defunding the police and defunding criminal justice. That is what their proposal is for next year.

They want to cut millions of dollars from successful programs to fund the Office on Violence Against Women, of course. For example, they want to cut millions from the Financial Assistance to Victims Program. They want to cut from consolidated youth-oriented programming, access to sexual assault nurse exams \$12 million and on and on.

That is their budget.

They want to cut \$538 million from the Byrne Discretionary Community Project Grants in the Department of Justice budget. They want to eliminate the Community Based Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative whose great successes they want to take credit for. They want to cut \$50 million from that.

They want to cut \$17 million in grants from the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes community policing program. And it goes on and on. You don't have to go and make up a bunch of mirages and ghosts about defunding the police. That is in their budget for next year. They want to dismantle one criminal justice program after another.

But of course, they want to increase the military budget to \$1.5 trillion, which they all leapt up to support even before hearing about what specific military projects and arms projects were contained in it. They want \$1.5 trillion for that budget as they continue to drive our budget deficit up to the heavens. They have added already more than \$3.5 trillion to the debt. So it is fiscally irresponsible, and it is irresponsible from the standpoint of public safety.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I said last time I was prepared to close. I assumed that was his closing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman reserve?

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

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. Is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I am prepared to keep going. I am not afraid to keep the debate going. Whatever the gentleman pleases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona reserve?

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which they propose to slash and essentially dismantle, is responsible for advancing the practice of community policing at the State, local, territorial, and Tribal levels. The COPS Office awards grants to hire community policing professionals, that is something that they propose to gut.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close. He seems to be in a hurry.

Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Look, it is unfortunate that we have reached this place, Madam Speaker. Every prior Congress has been able to honor the police on Law Enforcement Week. Yet, they insisted on scribbling polemical, partisan graffiti, attacking Democrats and Progressives and so on, using a nonbinding ceremonial resolution to try to pick a political fight, which is not very wise given their miserable record in terms of crime fighting.

One of the first things they did was they said they were no longer going to enforce the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Then they gutted anti-terrorism and counterintelligence programs in the Department of Justice. They pardoned 1,600 or 1,500 Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, Klan members, violent rioters, and insurrectionists from January 6. Even his own Vice President urged him—or said he supposed the President was not going to pardon those who had committed violence, but he pardoned everybody.

Prior to Donald Trump, you know, the way the Presidents did it was there was a pardon office in the Department of Justice, and they would look at very specific requests and applications that came in for a pardon, and they would try to judge whether the person was truly reformed, truly rehabilitated.

Every President up until Trump insisted that they actually pay off their

finances and pay restitution to their victims. But no, not President Trump. He said: I am going to take all of them together. I am going to pardon them en masse, 1,600 of them. Some of them were armed robbers, domestic felons, violent assaulters. Some maybe it was a first offense, but they were all mixed in together, and then they got their pardon, and they were forgiven for all of their fines and all of the restitution that they owed to their victims.

Then the President continued that rampage with all of the white-collar criminals and fraudsters and drug dealers he pardoned. Some of them owed tens of millions or hundreds of millions of dollars. It was all forgiven. That money was, therefore, transferred from the victims of these crimes right back to the criminals. This is the person that they want to praise as being tough on crime and such a great law-and-order President.

We were willing to look—aside from the fact that he had 34 criminal convictions of his own and was an adjudicated sexual assaulter under the civil law of New York—and say maybe he will actually invest in fighting crime. But no, it has been quite the opposite. He has been doing everything in his power to undermine criminal law enforcement. Now they want to take credit for what the mayors and Governors have been doing for several years now, which is causing a dramatic decrease in crime by investing in all of the programs that they have pulled the plug on.

They just slashed more than \$500 million from Department of Justice grants going out to the States and the cities. You want to look for weak on crime? You want to look for defunding the police? Look no further. You found it in the Trump administration. Elon Musk and DOGE came right over to the Department of Justice and slashed \$500 million from program moneys that were appropriated by Congress and programmed by the Department of Justice, and they said: Stop the delivery of this money. We are going to cut off these grants.

The reason they don't say anything about it is because they know it is true. We heard all about it in the Judiciary Committee. That is the real track record.

Now we see in their budget request for next year they want to continue to ravage the crime-fighting budget of the country.

Why did President Trump pardon the former President of Honduras who brought 400 tons of cocaine into America? Why? He brought in 800,000 pounds of cocaine. He said: We are going to shove it up the nostrils of the gringos. That is what he said. And Donald Trump pardoned him, saving him from decades in Federal prison.

□ 1730

How come they are not talking about that?

We wouldn't have brought any of it up if they had just come forward with

the same consensus, bipartisan resolution that we have always had. But no, they wanted to pick a partisan fight.

Well, they picked the wrong people, because we know what has actually been happening. We know who is standing strong for law and order and who is bringing us down into the mud of lawlessness and authoritarianism in the country.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to my colleague for a moment if he wants to respond about the pardon of the former President of Honduras, whether that is something that our colleagues on that side of the aisle support or not. I don't know if he is interested in responding to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland yields.

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I was just offering to yield if he wanted to respond to that question, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

We consider the safety of the people to be the highest law that there is, along with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Unfortunately, this administration has been trampling all of it. We saw what happened in Minneapolis where we had U.S. citizens shot down at pointblank range in broad daylight for exercising their First Amendment rights, the rights contained in the First Amendment of our Constitution, shot down in cold blood.

Then we saw their then-Attorney General, Ms. Bondi, come out and say that these people were engaged in acts of terror and had been threatening people, which was a lie, and she refused the opportunity to apologize for what she had done.

There will be a real investigation. There will be a real investigation of those homicides. There were only, up to that point, three homicides, three murders that took place in Minneapolis, in Minnesota, up until that point of the year, and two of them were committed by Federal agents, two of the three. Well, that is a pretty powerful statement about the law-and-order administration that they want to praise in this completely partisan resolution that they want to push through the House of Representatives today.

So the Constitution is under attack, right? They promulgate executive orders telling thousands of lawyers at different law firms they cannot enter Federal buildings, including Federal courthouses, which makes it difficult to practice law.

They have used their power of the Federal Communications Commission

to force them to settle completely bogus, frivolous lawsuits that the President has brought against media companies. Then they have installed their minders, their little spies, into TV networks, like something out of Putin's Russia or Orban's Hungary.

They have been systematically undermining the free press in the country. They are attacking the Constitution, and they are attacking the Bill of Rights.

It is so bad that even their stacked-and-packed, gerrymandered Supreme Court has had to strike them down for things like their illegal, unconstitutional tariffs, their global trade war against the world, which has been ruinous for our economy, compounded only by his illegal, constitutional war on Iran where he usurped the power of Congress to declare war.

James Madison said it had to be the Representatives of the people to declare war, not a President, not a Vice President, not Tulsi Gabbard or their leaky chat group. No, it has got to be the Representatives of the people, because the kings were constantly plunging their people into wars of conceit and vanity and imperial plunder.

They have created lawlessness from the highest levels of the government all the way down to the streets, where they are pulling the plug on Federal grants to help State and local governments fight crime, while they pardon narcotraffickers, white-collar fraudsters, people scamming American citizens.

So we are going to have to try to restore real law and order in the country, and that begins at the top. That begins with the Presidency, and it begins with everybody who is in government.

I wish that we could just go ahead and honor law enforcement without all of the partisan graffiti they have scrawled all over the resolution. We would show just as before, you have an overwhelming vote when you do it the right way, and we honor the people who have served us.

I invite our friends to join us in honoring and standing by the men and women who defended us on January 6. One hundred fifty of them were wounded, injured, hospitalized, disfigured, and disabled. Some of them were disabled and forced out of police work because of the injuries inflicted by the mob that came here.

They have given nearly \$5 million to Ashley Babbitt's family, despite the fact that two different investigations showed that the police had acted reasonably and lawfully in what they did.

How about millions of dollars to the families of the police officers who lost their lives as a result of that violence? Let's show for real that we are committed to law enforcement by standing by the police officers who defend us every single day.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentleman from Arizona has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We heard a lot about pardons. It is not mentioned at all in this resolution.

But it is real fun, you know, when you think about pardons, and I have got article after article here. There is a whole stack of them right here of the more than 3,000 people that President Biden pardoned, some massive fraudsters who never paid their restitution. Odd, isn't it?

Quite frankly, Joe Biden was going on a pardon-issuing spree to such an extent he even pardoned a few Members of Congress. How about that. That is pretty interesting to me.

Let's see. If you didn't know what was in this resolution, as most Americans don't and anybody watching, you would think this is all about how heinous of an individual Donald J. Trump, our President, is. You saw that TDS on display.

But I am going to do a favor for everybody. I am going to go over the 11 clauses in this resolution that honor police officers.

By the way, Democrats couldn't even get a unanimous vote when the resolution we just voted on listed fallen officers. They think we are creating partisanship with this. That is not the case.

Facts are stubborn things. They don't want to honor police. They were the party of defund the police.

Let's take a look at the clauses.

Number one: "Whereas the brave men and women in law enforcement work tirelessly and relentlessly to safeguard the communities they are sworn to protect, serving as the backbone of public safety across our Nation."

What do my colleagues on the other side find controversial here? What is it? Do they deny that officers work tirelessly? Do they deny that communities depend on them? Because if you can't even affirm this, your problem isn't with the resolution. It is with reality.

Number two: "Whereas law enforcement officers bear the critical responsibility of upholding the rule of law and maintaining the safety, stability, and public order upon which our communities depend."

What offends them, the rule of law part or the idea that safety and stability actually matter? They never touched on this.

Number three: "Whereas law enforcement officers routinely and selflessly risk their own lives and safety to combat crime, remove dangerous and lethal drugs from our streets, and stand in defense of the most vulnerable among us."

What is their objection? What is their objection? Do they think law enforcement don't risk their lives, that drugs aren't lethal or that the vulnerable don't deserve that shield? They

should tell the widows and orphans of fallen officers why this fact bothers them.

Number four: "Whereas law enforcement officers strengthen our communities through outreach, mentorship, crisis response, and countless daily acts of service that frequently go unrecognized."

Which of these acts of service do they reject? The mentorship? The crisis intervention?

Number five: "Whereas from resolving neighborhood disputes to checking in on elderly residents and guiding youth programs, officers provide a quiet and steady presence that extends far beyond traditional law enforcement duties."

Is it the neighborhood dispute resolution that you oppose or the very idea of a steady, positive police presence?

□ 1740

What is it that you oppose?

Number six: "Whereas rhetoric and policies from leftist activists and progressive politicians seek to defund or dismantle local police departments, undermine public safety, and place both officers and the communities they serve at greater risk."

I thought this was your goal. For years many of you and your allies championed it in the streets. You posted on official social media accounts. You introduced legislation and redirected budgets away from law enforcement. The defund the police movement wasn't some fever dream. It was your rallying cry.

Do you deny now that that rhetoric ever existed?

Do you deny that progressive politicians and leftist activists aggressively pushed these policies in cities across the country?

Do you deny the explosion in violent crime?

You can't spend years trying to kneecap, starve, and demonize the police and then act outraged when a resolution dares to call it what it was: a dangerous failure that hurt people.

Number seven: "Whereas sanctuary city policies that restrict cooperation with Federal immigration authorities can compel local law enforcement agencies to divert already limited resources and actively encourage resentment toward local law enforcement."

Again, I thought this was your goal. We have heard it loud and clear from dozens of your own politicians from Minnesota to Boston, California and beyond, people proudly declaring they will not cooperate with Federal immigration enforcement. They will shield the illegal aliens, even the worst of the worst: murderers, rapists, and gang members. They will keep them out on the streets rather than let ICE do its job.

Do they deny these sanctuary policies exist and deliberately restrict cooperation with Federal authorities?

Almost one-third of Americans live in sanctuary jurisdictions. You can't

champion policies that protect criminals over cops and then act shocked when the resolution says sanctuary policies sabotage law enforcement at every level.

"Whereas the Trump administration's focus on restoring law and order has contributed to a notable decline in homicide rates, with levels reaching among the lowest recorded in over a century."

Data is data, and facts are facts. A report by the Council on Criminal Justice says this: Homicides in 35 major cities declined by 21 percent from 2024 to 2025. Just in Washington, D.C., President Trump is protecting our citizens from failed progressive governance. We have seen incredible drops in violence. Homicides are down 52 percent. Sex abuse is down 48 percent, robbery is down 23 percent, and vehicle theft is down 56 percent. All crime overall is down 25 percent, and Washington, D.C., is on pace for roughly 42 murders this year, the lowest rates since at least 1930. Compare that to the 274 murders in 2023.

Number nine: "Whereas drug overdose deaths in the United States have declined significantly, reaching their lowest levels since 2019."

Which part of that is fake news to you? The decline? The significance? Or is it the timing as enforcement and border focus tighten?

Under Biden administration's catastrophic open-border policies, fentanyl poured across the southern border like never before, over 100,000 deaths, killing tens of thousands. That wasn't an accident. It was a predictable deadly result in prioritizing illegal immigration over American lives.

Now with the Trump administration's renewed focus on securing the border, cracking down on traffickers and backing law enforcement, the body count is falling. Lives are being saved. We are reversing that damage.

They should own their failure or at least get out of the way while we clean it up.

Number 11: "Whereas law enforcement officers deserve our deepest respect, unwavering support, and profound gratitude."

Let me ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you vote against this resolution, are you voting against gratitude for these men and women who deserve our grateful attitudes and thankfulness?

Explain it.

Mr. Speaker, he is out of order. He knows he is getting whipped, and that is why he is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order. The gentleman from Maryland has not been recognized.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, that is a perfect example of what happens when the Democrats cannot answer for their policies that have wrecked cities and demeaned police of-

ficers. They have to be rude and interrupt. They can't sit silent because they know that they are profoundly responsible for the results of their policies.

I want them to explain to every officer watching right now, explain to their families, and explain to their spouses who lost a partner and the parentless children and tell them why basic appreciation for the people who risk their lives is somehow too much to ask.

Tell them why they don't deserve respect. Tell them why they don't deserve support.

After everything, after your defund movement, you cheered. After the sanctuary policies you defended and you continue to defend, after the crime waves your ideology unleashed, and after watching this country bleed for years under your failed experiments of policies, you can't bring yourself to say a simple thank you.

Enough. The American people are done with your excuses. They are done watching you demonize the only people standing between them and anarchy.

We support our police. We will back the blue, and we will pass this resolution to send one unmistakable message: In America, law enforcement officers have friends, they have allies, and they have the unwavering gratitude of a grateful nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit H.R. 1346; Passage of H.R. 1346, if ordered; Adoption of H. Con. Res. 96; and Motions to suspend the rules and agree to:

H. Res. 1251; and

H. Res. 1259.

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