

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 350, DOMESTIC TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7688, CONSUMER FUEL PRICE GOUGING PREVENTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7790, INFANT FORMULA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MR. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1124 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1124

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 350) to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism. 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. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7688) to protect consumers from price-gouging of consumer fuels, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 3 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After debate pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part C of

the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7790) making emergency supplemental appropriations to address the shortage of infant formula in the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, 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 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 Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Thursday, May 19, 2022, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of May 16, 2022, May 17, 2022, May 18, 2022, or May 19, 2022, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHNEIDER). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER) my distinguished friend from the Rules Committee, 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. MORELLE. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1445

MR. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1124, providing for consideration of three measures:

First, H.R. 350, the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager's management from Chairman NADLER, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and provides one motion to recommit.

Second, H.R. 7688, the Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act, under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman PALLONE, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, makes in order two amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Third, H.R. 7790, the Infant Formula Supplemental Appropriations Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on certain suspension bills. This authority lasts through May 19, 2022.

MR. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of several critical measures, and I would like to begin by saying a few words about H.R. 350, the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act.

Just this past weekend, the entire Nation watched in horror as a white supremacist with a history of violent threats brutally slaughtered 10 people, almost all of whom were Black, in the city of Buffalo, New York. My heart breaks for the community still reeling from this senseless tragedy only 75 miles down the road from my home in Rochester.

The FBI is investigating the shooting as a hate crime, and the gunman wrote a racist and anti-Semitic 180-page document outlining his motivation for the attack. The gunman intentionally targeted a predominantly Black neighborhood and had plans to attack multiple locations afterward, including in Rochester, as has been widely reported in the media.

MR. Speaker, there has been an undeniable surge in domestic terrorism and other forms of extremism across our Nation. An analysis performed by the nonpartisan Center for Strategic and International Studies found that domestic terrorism in 2020 was at the highest level of any year since 1994, which is the earliest year the organization analyzed data.

Domestic terrorism is the most significant threat to our Nation in generations. Events like the horrific slaughter of Black community members in Buffalo have become common in our country, and it is time for the Federal Government to step up and to save lives.

Before us today, we have legislation that helps to provide the tools and resources law enforcement and our communities need to coordinate and combat these threats.

The Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act prioritizes the investigation and prosecution of domestic terrorism at the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, and the FBI, creating a new office in all three

agencies dedicated to this issue, promoting information sharing among public safety officials to better ensure an effective and organized joint effort, and requiring Federal agencies to provide training and resources to assist State and local law enforcement in detecting and investigating acts of domestic terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, these are simple, commonsense actions that will help protect our communities. They should be non-controversial. In fact, nearly identical legislation passed by voice vote last Congress. But so far this year, it appears something has changed. Despite the rising incidence of hate crimes and the urgent need to provide law enforcement with what they need to combat vicious acts of domestic terrorism, every Republican on the House Judiciary Committee voted against the bill in a markup last month. While only three Republicans have cosponsored the bill this year, I hope more of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will again support this bill when it comes to the floor for a vote.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 7688, the Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act, which will directly address the pain that American families are feeling at the pump.

During a time of decreased oil production related to the pandemic and global uncertainty around the global gas market due to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, oil and gas companies are reporting historic profits.

In the first 3 months of 2022 alone, ExxonMobil made \$5.5 billion in profits; Chevron made \$6.3 billion; and Shell made a record-breaking \$9.1 billion.

Everyday Americans continue to see high gas prices, but Big Oil has clearly decided to keep production low so their own profits can stay high. Crude oil prices have declined around 20 percent from their peak in early March, but retail prices have gone down by only 4 percent during that same time. Oil companies are raking in record profits at the expense of hardworking American families, who are struggling to keep up with sky-high prices at the pump. Simply put, this is un-American.

In an effort to help working families, President Biden called on Big Oil to ramp up supply instead of simply reaping profits without making any additional investment in supply shortages. How did these companies respond? They announced their intentions to use their record-high profits for stock buybacks. ExxonMobil announced it would triple its purchase of its own stock by spending up to \$30 billion on stock buybacks, and Chevron will purchase \$10 billion of stock before the end of this year.

The Biden administration has already taken steps to lower prices, including by releasing 80 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, with another 1 million barrels daily for the next 6 months.

Today, the House is taking further action by granting enhanced authority to the FTC and State attorneys general to police excessive or exploitative price increases of gasoline and home energy fuel during a declared energy crisis. The penalties collected from these companies will be deposited in a consumer relief trust fund administered by the U.S. Treasury Department.

While some of my colleagues continue to merely talk about rising gas prices, we are actually presenting a solution to the problem today. House Democrats are taking action on behalf of working families to put more money in their pockets instead of supporting stock buybacks and exploitative price gouging by the oil and gas industry.

Lastly, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7790, the Infant Formula Supplemental Appropriations Act. Working families living paycheck to paycheck are struggling, and they need safe, affordable baby formula to keep their children healthy.

Baby formula supplies are out of stock at stores across the country, threatening the health of infants and creating panic among their parents and caretakers. Ongoing supply chain issues and the Abbott formula recall have led to the shortages.

On Monday, the FDA reached a deal with Abbott to reopen the processing plant that had been closed due to the recall, and the Biden administration also announced the FDA would issue new guidance to ease import restrictions with the goal of bringing the most formula into the country as possible.

But with 75 percent of families at least partially dependent on formula to feed their young children, it is imperative that Congress take additional action as well.

This legislation provides emergency funding to both address the formula shortage and help prevent it from ever happening again. The supplemental bill provides \$28 million for additional staff at the FDA to better address infant formula safety and supply issues, IT system improvements to expand health fraud tools, and stronger supply chain monitoring and assessments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation taking critical action to bolster American families and protect our communities.

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

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of three pieces of legislation, including H.R. 350, which my colleagues claim will prevent incidents of domestic terrorism. But let's make no mistake, Republicans are committed to fighting hatred and violence in all forms.

Unfortunately, H.R. 350 does absolutely nothing to actually make our

communities safer. Rather, this legislation expands the Federal bureaucracy. It ignores new and evolving domestic terrorist threats, and it makes it more difficult for law enforcement to recruit and retain qualified candidates.

Alarming, it empowers Biden's DOJ to continue labeling American parents and other political opponents as threats to stifle their First Amendment rights.

The rule before us today also provides for consideration of H.R. 7688, the Democrats' attempt to distract and shift blame for President Biden's self-inflicted energy crisis. Since his first day in office, President Biden has waged an unrelenting war on American energy producers. From canceling the Keystone XL pipeline to suspending oil and gas leasing on Federal lands, President Biden's radical Green New Deal policies have discouraged and denied development of American energy resources and the American energy sector.

Yet, at the same time that Joe Biden has done all this, he absolutely refuses to take any accountability for the soaring gas prices and the economic pain he continues to inflict on hardworking American families.

First, the President tried to blame Putin, despite the fact that gas prices had risen more than 50 percent during his first year in office. A quick history lesson: That is 1 year before Russia ever invaded Ukraine. In fact, gas prices have increased every single month of this Presidency.

Now, the President is blaming hardworking oil and gas producers in places like Pennsylvania and across the country, accusing them of price gouging, even though multiple FTC investigations have repeatedly concluded supply and demand is the ultimate driver of these rising prices and, by the way, an artificial decrease in supply thanks to these radical policies.

H.R. 7688 will impose a socialist price-fixing scheme on oil and gas, leading to even less production, which will hit small businesses and American families the hardest.

Now, I wasn't alive in the 1970s, but I know there are a lot of Members in this Chamber who were, and I am sure they can remember waiting in line to fuel up their cars. If H.R. 7688 is signed into law, that travesty will once again be a reality.

Finally, the rule before us makes in order H.R. 7790, the Infant Formula Supplemental Appropriations Act. Under President Biden's leadership, our Nation is facing an infant formula supply crisis, with reports that more than 40 percent of formula is out of stock. Instead of working with Republicans to redirect excess stocks of formula at Federal agencies and force the FDA to develop a plan to address this shortage, House Democrats simply want to throw money at the problem with absolutely no plan, no guardrails to ensure that funding is spent to actually put baby formula back on grocery store shelves.

Let me be clear. We are giving \$28 million to the very same unelected career bureaucrats who failed to address this crisis when it came to their attention a year ago. It is absolute madness.

H.R. 7790 will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to alleviate Biden's baby formula crisis, and it is American babies and American families who will be forced to suffer the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to mention that today's rule also does not make in order a single Republican amendment, but I guess I shouldn't be surprised. Republicans have attempted to work with our Democratic colleagues to make our communities safer, to address inflation and lower gas prices, and to help parents feed their babies. But it is absolutely clear from today's rule and from their actions over the last 3 years that House Democrats would rather continue their partisan political theater than put forth real solutions to help real Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I will respond to my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee.

When we talk about the need to have bipartisanship and to work together, I would again note that the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act passed by a voice vote in the previous Congress just 2 years ago, yet not only will it not pass by a voice vote, it won't pass under our efforts to suspend the rules. It required going to the Rules Committee; it will require a vote on the floor; and I daresay, based on the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee, that we will have to pass it with little Republican support, something I regret. We would not only welcome their support, but this was a bipartisan bill.

I don't think that says anything about where we have gone. I think it says a great deal, though, about where my colleagues have gone and how far they have moved away from what is commonsense, thoughtful legislation that reins in a growing threat in America that has been recognized by society and recognized by our military, and that is the growth of extremism in America.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and my very good friend.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I will start by acknowledging the sorrow and terror inflicted upon the families and loved ones of the victims of the hateful attack in Buffalo last weekend.

The brutal murders that occurred in Buffalo were yet another heartbreaking landmark in the growing storm of domestic terrorism impacting communities across America.

Whether in Buffalo, Charleston, El Paso, or Pittsburgh, domestic terror-

ists are being radicalized online, fueled by elected officials and media pundits who either embrace or wink at twisted white supremacist ideology spawned in the darkest corners of the internet and infecting our Nation.

Communities across America are terrified, scared to go to their supermarkets, schools, churches, mosques, and synagogues because of the fear that the combination of lax gun laws and unchecked white supremacist conspiracies will have deadly consequences.

But with this bill, we are here to say that we are one American community, and we will remain united in the face of these attacks. Where domestic terrorists aim to scare and divide our communities against each other, we must come together and condemn this hateful ideology and give law enforcement the tools to fight its most violent consequences.

We are Americans; we are proud of our diversity; and we must choose community over chaos. That is why I am proud to support the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act.

□ 1500

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE), my good friend.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the combined rule and the underlying fuel prices legislation in this package as it seeks to cast blame on hardworking Americans in the energy industry and offers no real solutions.

The underlying bill, H.R. 7688, establishes de facto price control on fuels, a dangerous step that has the potential to create fuel shortages. Many Americans remember the long lines of cars waiting at gas stations in the mid-1970s, and they do not want to return to that scenario.

But don't take my word for it. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce warned Congress last night that this bill has the potential to cause, "... rationing, gas lines, and a much greater dependence on imported energy. . . ."

Madam Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the price of gasoline is determined on a global market based on supply and demand. The way to lower prices is to increase supply, and we can do that by unleashing American production.

Sadly, the administration has been doing the exact opposite, delaying permit approvals, denying access to public lands, and gaslighting the energy industry.

What is worse, just today, the administration announced that they are removing sanctions on Venezuela in order to import foreign oil from a hostile socialist country.

In my home State of Oklahoma, nearly a quarter of all jobs are con-

nected to the energy industry. Frankly, this legislation is insulting to hardworking Oklahomans throughout the Fifth Congressional District whose efforts power this great Nation.

Instead of legislation that blames American energy producers, we should roll back the onerous energy policies of the Biden administration and unleash American energy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the rule and to reject the underlying bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I do want to be clear because the distinguished gentlewoman mentioned hardworking Oklahomans, and we certainly appreciate their hard work.

This isn't about the hardworking men and women in Oklahoma who work for oil and gas companies. This is about the leadership of those companies that make decisions about where their dollars are going to be invested.

Just to reiterate what I said earlier, ExxonMobil made \$5.5 billion in profits just in the first three months of 2022; Chevron, \$6.3 billion in profits; Shell made a record-breaking \$9.1 billion. On top of it, they are going to do their own buybacks of stocks.

ExxonMobil announced it would triple purchasing its own stock by spending up to \$30 billion on stock buybacks. Chevron will spend \$10 billion on buying stock before the end of this year; they have announced that.

Madam Speaker, this isn't about the hardworking men and women who we respect. This is about corporate executives who decide to put their interest before the interest of the American people, particularly at a time when we are struggling to get them to increase production and we are facing a global crisis in oil and gas because of activities around the world by Vladimir Putin, and his unwanted aggression against the people of Ukraine, which has disrupted the energy market worldwide.

Madam Speaker, just to be clear, I appreciate the gentlewoman's sentiments, but we are not talking about hardworking men and women. We are talking about CEOs who decided to put their profits ahead of American interests. That is what we are talking about.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my great friend and colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

The rise of racially motivated violent extremism is a serious threat to Americans across the country. We, in Congress, can't stop the likes of Tucker Carlson from spewing hateful, dangerous replacement theory ideology across the airwaves. Congress hasn't been able to ban the sale of assault weapons. The Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act is what Congress can do

this week to try to prevent future Buffalo shootings, prevent future California shootings, future El Paso shootings, future Charleston shootings, future Pittsburgh shootings, or future Wisconsin shootings.

We need to ensure that Federal law enforcement has the resources they need to best preemptively identify and thwart extremist violence wherever that threat appears.

In 2020, this House passed the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act on a voice vote with overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle. I thank my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, who saw the benefit of this legislation and sent it to the Senate. It didn't get a vote in the Senate in 2020, which is why we are here today. I am grateful that this legislation is being brought forward today in this moment.

To those who are considering voting against this bill, I ask them the following:

What has happened in the 2 years since that they no longer support this legislation?

What has changed that they no longer support giving the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security, the resources they need to keep Americans safe, to make sure kids in their schools don't fear the threat of terrorism, that people shopping in a grocery store, going about their business, don't have to worry about someone coming in and killing them simply because of the color of their skin.

What has changed in 2 years that after sending this to the Senate on a voice vote, without any opposition from Republicans, today, we are not there?

Following the vote in 2020, we introduced this bill on January 19, 2021; three Democrats, three Republicans leading that with me. It was bipartisan. We have added nearly 200 Democrats to the list, and the Republicans stand silently by. The only thing that has changed in 2 years is that the risk of violence, the risk of domestic terror has gone up.

Madam Speaker, I am calling on my colleagues, I am pleading with my colleagues, join us in this legislation. Let's join together and send a message that we stand with Federal law enforcement, we stand with American communities, and we stand against domestic terrorism.

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

Madam Speaker, I would be more than happy to answer the question that my friend from Illinois posed.

The difference from 2 years ago and now is that the DOJ has started going after concerned parents that are showing up at school board meetings labeling them domestic terrorists.

The difference is that the Department of Homeland Security thinks it is fitting to have a truth and disinformation board, like something

from an Orwellian novel. This is a different time.

Also, in the last 2 years, we had \$2 billion of damage that was caused by antifa. Yet, my colleagues across the aisle refuse to label antifa a domestic terrorist organization.

Those are just a few of the things that have changed between now and the last time we had this bill.

Now, my good friend from New York was talking about the oil and gas industry. Let me just remind everybody that in 2020, the oil and gas industry lost \$76 billion.

There was talk about buybacks. Maybe we should consider why these buybacks are occurring. Maybe it is because of investor shareholder activism and this notion of ESGs that has something to do with it. And by the way, that activism also dries up investment and capital into the oil and gas industry.

But don't take my word for it, Dr. Jason Furman of Harvard University—clearly no bastion of conservative thought—he actually was an adviser to President Obama. Listen to what he said: “When more people want to buy things than companies are capable of making, prices go up. That's just the law of supply and demand. Companies always want to maximize their profits. I don't think they're doing it any more this year than any other year.”

Again, that was Jason Furman, not exactly a conservative.

But while we are talking about all these issues, we are also failing to talk about police week. It is National Police Week. Across our Nation, police departments are struggling to recruit new officers, to fill open positions. Some cities are facing shortages as high as 17 percent. At the same time, our Nation is in the midst of a crime crisis with homicide rates up 48 percent compared with just 2 years ago.

The crime crisis is a direct result of President Biden and the Democrats' efforts to demonize the police, to defund the police, and also pushing for soft-on-crime policies.

House Republicans will always stand with our police. We will always invest in our Nation's law enforcement, and we will always fight to make our communities safer.

That is why, if we defeat this previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider the Communities Deserve Cops Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHER-

FORD), a former sheriff, good friend, and the author of this legislation, here to explain the amendment.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 7809, the Communities Deserve Cops Act. My bill will make retention and hiring bonuses allowable for COPS grants.

Madam Speaker, I spent over 40 years in law enforcement, including 12 as sheriff, and I know firsthand the challenges that agencies all across America are facing in hiring, training and retaining their personnel. However, the challenges I faced as sheriff pale in comparison to what these agencies face today.

Police departments across America are in the middle of a hiring crisis. After years of far-left politicians defunding, demoralizing, and delegitimizing police officers, we are seeing now the disastrous results. A recent survey, as was mentioned earlier, found some cities are facing shortages as high as 17 percent. Just last year, retirements nationwide went up 45 percent.

And guess what? Violent crime also increased in every major city across the Northeast almost. Less officers equals more crime, plain and simple.

Madam Speaker, this pattern of retirements and difficulty recruiting new officers is unsustainable and will have disastrous effects.

My legislation makes a very small but necessary change to how COPS grants are utilized. In addition to using COPS funding to hire, train, and equip officers, agencies will be able to use Federal dollars to offer financial bonuses up to \$5,000 to keep officers on the force and to attract and hire new officers.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim to support law enforcement. So I ask you: Join with us in this important moment. Join with us in voting “yes” today that you will fund and not defund the police.

As we wrap up National Police Week, let's show the police officers across America that we have their back.

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

Madam Speaker, I do want to just respond briefly to my colleague, Mr. RESCHENTHALER. I don't believe domestic terrorism in any form, by any side—right, left, center—is acceptable in America. And so without regard to that, I would say this bill would look at all domestic terrorism.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a May 17, 2022, New York Times article entitled, “The Right's Violence Problem.”

[From The New York Times, May 17, 2022]

THE RIGHT'S VIOLENCE PROBLEM

(By David Leonhardt)

Over the past decade, the Anti-Defamation League has counted about 450 U.S. murders committed by political extremists.

Of these 450 killings, right-wing extremists committed about 75 percent. Islamic extremists were responsible for about 20 percent, and left-wing extremists were responsible for 4 percent.

Nearly half of the murders were specifically tied to white supremacists.

As this data shows, the American political right has a violence problem that has no equivalent on the left. And the 10 victims in Buffalo this past weekend are now part of this toll. "Right-wing extremist violence is our biggest threat," Jonathan Greenblatt, the head of the ADL, has written. "The numbers don't lie."

The pattern extends to violence less severe than murder, like the Jan. 6 attack on Congress. It also extends to the language from some Republican politicians—including Donald Trump—and conservative media figures that treats violence as a legitimate form of political expression. A much larger number of Republican officials do not use this language but also do not denounce it or punish politicians who do use it; Kevin McCarthy, the top House Republican, is a leading example.

It's important to emphasize that not all extremist violence comes from the right—and that the precise explanation for any one attack can be murky, involving a mixture of ideology, mental illness, gun access and more. In the immediate aftermath of an attack, people are sometimes too quick to claim a direct cause and effect. But it is also incorrect to pretend that right-wing violence and left-wing violence are equivalent problems.

FEARS IN WASHINGTON

If you talk to members of Congress and their aides these days—especially off the record—you will often hear them mention their fears of violence being committed against them.

Some Republican members of Congress have said that they were reluctant to vote for Trump's impeachment or conviction partly because of the threats against other members who had already denounced him. House Republicans who voted for President Biden's infrastructure bill also received threats. Democrats say their offices receive a spike in phone calls and online messages threatening violence after they are criticized on conservative social media or cable television shows.

People who oversee elections report similar problems. "One in six election officials have experienced threats because of their job," the Brennan Center, a research group, reported this year. "Ranging from death threats that name officials' young children to racist and gendered harassment, these attacks have forced election officials across the country to take steps like hiring personal security, fleeing their homes, and putting their children into counseling."

There is often overlap between these violent threats and white supremacist beliefs. White supremacy tends to treat people of color as un-American or even less than fully human, views that can make violence seem justifiable. The suspect in the Buffalo massacre evidently posted an online manifesto that discussed replacement theory, a racial conspiracy theory that Tucker Carlson promotes on his Fox News show.

"History has taught us that what begins with words ends in far worse," Representative Liz Cheney, one of the few Republicans who have repeatedly and consistently denounced violence and talk of violence from the right, wrote on Twitter yesterday.

A few other Republicans, like Senator Mitt Romney, have taken a similar stance. But many other prominent Republicans have taken a more neutral stance or even em-

braced talk of violence. Some have spoken openly about violence as a legitimate political tool—and not just Trump, who has done so frequently.

At the rally that preceded the Jan. 6 attack, Representative Mo Brooks suggested the crowd should "start taking down names and kicking ass."

Rick Perry, a former Texas governor, once called the Federal Reserve "treasonous" and talked about treating its chairman "pretty ugly." During Greg Gianforte's campaign for Montana's House seat, he went so far as to assault a reporter who asked him a question he didn't like; Gianforte won and has since become Montana's governor.

These Republicans have received no meaningful sanction from their party.

This Republican comfort with violence is new. Republican leaders from past decades, like Ronald Reagan, Bob Dole, Howard Baker and the Bushes, did not evoke violence.

"In a stable democracy," Steven Levitsky, a Harvard political scientist, told me, "politicians unambiguously reject violence and unambiguously expel from their ranks anti-democratic forces." <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/05/17/briefing/right-wing-mass-shootings.htm>.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, sadly, the horrifying attack in Buffalo, New York, this weekend is just the tip of the iceberg.

According to a 2021 report by the Anti-Defamation League, there have been 450 murders committed by political extremists over the last 10 years, 75 percent attributed to rightwing groups, 55 percent of those were tied to white supremacists, four percent in the report were tied to leftwing supremacists—an amazing amount, 75 percent to 4 percent.

It is appalling to argue that some things are fine and there is no need to address root causes of violence. I am calling on all my colleagues to do something about white nationalism, calling on all my colleagues to do something about domestic terrorism before another domestic terror attack occurs fueled by hatred, as we witnessed in Buffalo, New York.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I just have to push back a little bit on my good friend from New York because the facts just don't line up with his argument, respectfully.

I will give you a great example. During the committee markup, Representative STEUBE of Florida offered an amendment to strike references to white supremacists and neo-Nazis, and insert neo-Nazis, white supremacists, antifa, Black Lives Matter, and radicalized social justice organizations.

So when the Democrats had the chance to actually include a whole slew of domestic terror organizations, when they had the chance, that amendment that Representative STEUBE offered, it failed on a party-line vote with only one Republican joining the Democrats in voting "no."

□ 1515

While Democrats refused to put antifa, Black Lives Matter, and

radicalized social justice organizations into the definition of "domestic terrorism," they simultaneously believed that concerned parents at school board meetings are the domestic terrorists. That is the problem, and that is what has changed between 2 years and now.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) to talk more about the police. Again, it is Police Week, and we are doing very little talking about the police.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question so we can amend the rule and immediately consider H.R. 7809, the Communities Deserve Cops Act, which allows for the use of COPS grants to provide officers with signing and retention bonuses up to \$5,000.

Predictably, Madam Speaker, we have seen shocking increases in violent crime following the calls from my friends across the aisle to defund the police.

This week is National Police Week, a time when we should be honoring those who put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe. Sadly, we are not taking the opportunity to vote on legislation to bolster law enforcement and decrease violent crime.

Despite House leadership having numerous bipartisan bills to vote on, only two bills have been added to the suspension calendar. The Senate Judiciary Committee is taking up five bills tomorrow.

Representative RUTHERFORD's legislation provides much-needed assistance for agencies to hire and retain officers. The COPS grant program is vital to law enforcement agencies of all sizes, but while it has continued to receive funds, it has not been authorized since 2009.

I have also introduced a bill with Representative SPANBERGER that would reauthorize the COPS grant program and help low-income, rural agencies compete for these grants. It has 53 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. More of my Democratic colleagues have cosponsored it than Republicans. If Speaker PELOSI would allow a vote on the floor, it would pass.

There are many more bipartisan law enforcement bills that deserve to see the light of day. I hope that, moving forward, we can work together to support the many bipartisan law enforcement bills that deliver targeted solutions to the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the previous question so that we can provide the needed support for law enforcement agencies.

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

I must say, and I have the highest regard for my colleague, anyone who would equate the Black Lives Matter movement and the protests organized over the murder of George Floyd with white supremacists like the one who killed 10 people in Buffalo and targeted

Black Americans, equating that is irresponsible and reprehensible at best.

Talk about false equivalence. I am nearly speechless that we would even begin down that road. Maybe that says a lot about why the national Republican effort has changed so dramatically in just 2 years, when this Congress accepted by voice vote the Domestic Terrorism Act that we have before us.

I also include in the RECORD an October 15, 2021, Washington Post fact check article titled “The false GOP claim that the Justice Department is spying on parents at school board meetings.”

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 2021]

THE FALSE GOP CLAIM THAT THE JUSTICE DEPT. IS SPYING ON PARENTS AT SCHOOL BOARD MEETINGS

(By Salvador Rizzo)

“Attorney General Garland is weaponizing the DOJ by using the FBI to pursue concerned parents and silence them through intimidation. Florida will defend the free speech rights of its citizens and will not allow federal agents to squelch dissent.”

—Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis (R), in a tweet, Oct. 5

“Now the FBI is trying to silence parents. That’s wrong.”

—Glenn Youngkin, Republican nominee for Virginia governor, in a campaign ad, Oct. 13

Because of a “disturbing spike” in threats directed at public school officials, Attorney General Merrick Garland issued a memorandum this month calling on the FBI and federal prosecutors to meet with local law enforcement agencies and set up “dedicated lines of communication.”

Republicans are sounding the alarm over Garland’s one-page memo, claiming in interviews, congressional hearings, campaign ads and social media that the Justice Department is cracking down on parents simply for dissenting at their local school board meetings.

These meetings, where the nation’s almost 14,000 public school districts debate and set their policies, can become heated over questions such as how to teach race in the classroom and whether coronavirus vaccinations and tests or face masks should be required, among other issues. Some school board members have grown concerned for their safety as their forums have turned more vitriolic, and one recently reported a death threat and resigned.

The bottom line is Republicans are reading much more into Garland’s memo than it says. The memo focuses strictly on “violence, threats of violence, and other forms of intimidation and harassment”—all of which are crimes—not on parents raising questions or complaints.

THE FACTS

The Oct. 4 memo, addressed to FBI Director Christopher A. Wray and federal prosecutors, reads in part:

In recent months, there has been a disturbing spike in harassment, intimidation, and threats of violence against school administrators, board members, teachers, and staff who participate in the vital work of running our nation’s public schools. While spirited debate about policy matters is protected under our Constitution, that protection does not extend to threats of violence or efforts to intimidate individuals based on their views.

Threats against public servants are not only illegal, they run counter to our nation’s core values The Department takes

these incidents seriously and is committed to using its authority and resources to discourage these threats, identify them when they occur, and prosecute them when appropriate

Coordination and partnership with local law enforcement is critical to implementing these measures for the benefit of our nation’s nearly 14,000 public school districts. To this end, I am directing the Federal Bureau of Investigation, working with each United States Attorney, to convene meetings with federal, state, local, Tribal, and territorial leaders in each federal judicial district within 30 days of the issuance of this memorandum. These meetings will facilitate the discussion of strategies for addressing threats against school administrators, board members, teachers, and staff, and will open dedicated lines of communication for threat reporting, assessment, and response

Garland’s memo added, “In the coming days, the Department will announce a series of measures designed to address the rise in criminal conduct directed toward school personnel.”

In an accompanying news release, the Justice Department said, “Those efforts are expected to include the creation of a task force, consisting of representatives from the department’s Criminal Division, National Security Division, Civil Rights Division, the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys, the FBI, the Community Relations Service and the Office of Justice Programs, to determine how federal enforcement tools can be used to prosecute these crimes, and ways to assist state, Tribal, territorial and local law enforcement where threats of violence may not constitute federal crimes.”

And: “The Justice Department will also create specialized training and guidance for local school boards and school administrators. This training will help school board members and other potential victims understand the type of behavior that constitutes threats, how to report threatening conduct to the appropriate law enforcement agencies, and how to capture and preserve evidence of threatening conduct to aid in the investigation and prosecution of these crimes.”

Put it all together, and Garland is calling for 1) strategy meetings between federal and local law enforcement, 2) a task force, 3) dedicated lines of communication for addressing threats, and 4) training and guidance for school officials. The news release says the Justice Department will study “how federal enforcement tools can be used to prosecute these crimes, and ways to assist state, Tribal, territorial and local law enforcement where threats of violence may not constitute federal crimes.” (Most violent crimes are investigated and prosecuted by state and local law enforcement agencies, not federal authorities.)

Some of the Republican officials we asked for comment pointed to a letter from the National School Boards Association (NSBA) that asked President Biden for federal resources to help monitor emerging threats. The letter was dated Sept. 29, days before the attorney general’s memo was released, and made various requests of federal agencies including the Justice Department.

“While local and state law enforcement agencies are working with public school officials in several communities to prevent further disruptions to educational services and school district operations, law enforcement officials in some jurisdictions need assistance—including help with monitoring the threat levels,” NSBA officials wrote to Biden.

“School board meetings have been disrupted in California, Florida, Georgia, and other states because of local directives for mask coverings to protect students and edu-

cators from COVID-19,” the group’s letter says. “An individual was arrested in Illinois for aggravated battery and disorderly conduct during a school board meeting. During two separate school board meetings in Michigan, an individual yelled a Nazi salute in protest to masking requirements, and another individual prompted the board to call a recess because of opposition to critical race theory.”

As noted in the letter, a school board member in Ohio received hate mail that said: “We are coming after you and all the members on the . . . BoE [Board of Education] You are forcing them to wear mask—for no reason in this world other than control. And for that you will pay dearly.” That correspondence is being investigated by police.

Days after the NSBA letter was sent, a school board chairman in North Carolina resigned and disclosed that his life had been threatened, WCCB Charlotte reported.

The NSBA letter said some “acts of malice, violence, and threats against public school officials . . . could be the equivalent to a form of domestic terrorism and hate crimes.”

“Most disturbingly, on page 4, the NSBA letter references Scott Smith—the Loudoun County, Virginia, parent who was arrested for protesting at a school board meeting in June—implying that his behavior was ‘extremist’ and warranting action from federal law enforcement,” said Christina Pushaw, a spokeswoman for DeSantis. “Smith’s supposed crime? He attempted to protest a Loudoun school’s coverup of his 14-year-old daughter’s sexual assault by a transgender classmate in her school bathroom.”

According to the Loudoun County Sheriff’s Department, in July, more than a month after an alleged assault at Stone Bridge High School on May 28, “a 14-year-old male was arrested in the case with two counts of forcible sodomy.” The same teen reportedly was charged with sexually assaulting another alleged female victim at a different high school last week.

Smith, the father of the first alleged victim, was found guilty of disorderly conduct and resisting arrest after an altercation at his local school board meeting in June, which Smith says he attended to protest how his daughter’s case was handled. “Deputies dragged him to the ground, then outside, where he continued struggling and arguing with them, threatening to kick their teeth out,” Loudoun Now reported.

“In citing Mr. Smith’s case as an example of behavior that justifies a federal crackdown, the NSBA letter asked the Biden administration to deploy federal law enforcement to silence and intimidate parents who have grave concerns that deserve to be heard,” Pushaw said. “The Loudoun County School Board is not the victim in this case.”

The NSBA, a nonprofit, has no relationship to the Justice Department. Garland’s memo makes no mention of the group, its letter to Biden or the examples it included.

Asked about DeSantis’s vow that “Florida will defend the free speech rights of its citizens and will not allow federal agents to squelch dissent,” Pushaw said: “At this time, it is too soon to speculate about legal actions, because the DOJ has not yet taken any legal action to infringe upon Floridians’ rights following this memo. As you know, the DOJ memo directs the FBI to work with U.S. attorneys and ‘convene meeting’ in each federal judicial district To be clear, Governor DeSantis is committed to protecting Floridians’ rights and will take legal action if future developments warrant that.”

A spokesman for Jordan, Russell Dye, said in an email that the only way the Justice Department could use “its authority and resources to discourage these threats, identify

them when they occur, and prosecute them when appropriate,” as the memo says, was by monitoring parents at school board meetings, as the congressman said.

“The only reasonable explanation is to have the FBI/DOJ watch what parents say at meetings and intimidate them into silence,” Dye said. “Pretty easy to understand.” (The FBI simply could get tips from local officials, as Garland’s memo envisions.)

Mark Bednar, a spokesman for McCarthy, said existing laws already establish criminal penalties for violence or threats as outlined in the memo. Bednar said the Justice Department’s move was heavy-handed and could have a chilling effect on parents who might otherwise speak up about their children’s education.

“Localized threats of violence are appropriately handled by local law enforcement,” Bednar said. “As such, the real question is why the Biden administration used the power of the federal government to publicly threaten ‘a series of measures’ aimed at addressing local school board meetings The unnecessary, ominous rhetoric from the DOJ’s memo could have a chilling effect on parents’ First Amendment engagement with their local schools.”

Garland spokesman Anthony Coley referred us to this line in the Justice Department memo: “While spirited debate about policy matters is protected under our Constitution, that protection does not extend to threats of violence or efforts to intimidate individuals based on their views.”

Coley also pointed to recent Senate testimony by Deputy Attorney General Lisa O. Monaco, the second-highest-ranking official at the department, and Assistant Attorney General Kristen M. Clarke, the head of the Civil Rights Division.

“Frankly, I don’t think we’ve ever seen anything like it in American history Are you aware of any time in American history when an attorney general has directed the FBI to begin to intervene in school board meetings—local school board meetings?” Hawley asked Monaco at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing Oct. 5.

“The memorandum is quite clear. It’s one page,” Monaco said. “And it asks the U.S. attorney community and the FBI special agents-in-charge to convene state and local law enforcement partners to ensure that there’s an open line of communication to address threats, to address violence—and that’s the appropriate role of the Department of Justice, to make sure that we are addressing criminal conduct and violence.” (A spokesman for Hawley did not respond to our questions on the record.)

When the same Senate committee met the next day for a different hearing, Clarke said in response to questions from Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) that parents “have the right to express their view, to challenge the school board, to ask for reforms.”

“The attorney general’s memo deals with threats against public servants and says the threats against public servants are not only illegal, they run counter to our nation’s core values,” Clarke said.

Youngkin, the Republican running for Virginia governor, received a “Pants on Fire” rating from PolitiFact this week for claiming his Democratic opponent, Terry McAuliffe, “calls in his friend Joe Biden to actually put the DOJ on Virginia parents.” No evidence indicates that Biden or McAuliffe were involved in Garland’s decision-making, and both the White House and McAuliffe have denied the allegation.

Nevertheless, Youngkin repeated the claim at an Oct. 13 rally in Culpeper, Va., after he had been fact-checked: “He calls his friend Joe Biden. Joe Biden calls the attorney general. And the attorney general calls the FBI

in to silence parents.” An abbreviated version of all this has made it into a new Youngkin campaign ad.

Asked about the claim, Youngkin spokesman Matt Wolking said in an email that McAuliffe had refused to take a position on Garland’s memo and therefore “admitted he won’t stand up for Virginia parents being targeted and intimidated by his party’s DOJ.”

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

These Republicans are turning a one-page memo on public safety into a dystopian plot in which Big Brother erases well-meaning parents for thinking freely.

The reality is school officials are reporting more concerns for their safety—some attendees at their meetings have been arrested for physical violence—and the Justice Department is calling for strategy sessions between federal and local law enforcement, a task force and dedicated lines of communication to address the threats, and training for school board members and others who might be targeted.

Dissenting parents would not be “silenced” by the feds under the attorney general’s memo, as DeSantis, and Youngkin have said. Garland wrote, “While spirited debate about policy matters is protected under our Constitution, that protection does not extend to threats of violence or efforts to intimidate individuals based on their views.”

These claims earn Four Pinocchios.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, we have heard this argument time and time again. It is blatantly incorrect. Attorney General Garland’s October 4 one-page memo they keep referencing says: “In the coming days, the Department will announce a series of measures designed to address the rise in criminal conduct directed toward school personnel.” Let me repeat it, “criminal conduct directed toward school personnel.” Criminal, not parents voicing opinions at a school board meeting.

We are talking about violent, credible threats being made to some of our country’s most important public servants and their families.

The reality is, school officials are reporting more concerns for their safety, as some attendees at their meetings have been arrested for physical violence. The Justice Department is calling for strategy sessions between Federal and local law enforcement, a task force and dedicated lines of communication to address the threats, and training for school board members and others who might be targeted. No intervention, no targeting free speech.

My wife retired after 30 years as a schoolteacher. I can’t imagine threats being directed toward schoolteachers and school personnel for simply doing their jobs and carrying out the best interests of children in this country.

They are being targeted in violent ways. It is as simple as that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I have a lot of respect for my good friend from New York, but, again, facts don’t care about friendships. If you look at the facts, and just a quick his-

tory lesson, on September 29, 2021, the National School Boards Association sent a letter to the Biden White House asking the administration to treat parents as terrorists. Madam Speaker, 5 days after that letter, which, again, asks Biden’s DOJ to treat parents as domestic terrorists, 5 days later, Attorney General Garland sent a memo to the Director of the FBI, directing the FBI to work with each U.S. attorney to convene meetings with Federal, local, and territorial leaders within 30 days of the issuance of the memo and to open dedicated lines of communication for threats reported at school board meetings. Just a few weeks after that, they created a threat tag to be used on parents.

Fast forward, during a markup in the Judiciary Committee, Judiciary Republicans expressed concerns that H.R. 350 will codify what took place last fall, treating parents as domestic terrorists.

To date, that memo has not been rescinded.

Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE) to see if he supports the actions of the Attorney General, if he supports the letter, and if he has anything to say in response.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I would say this: This is beyond absurd. Parents can speak out at school board meetings. Free speech in the United States is not only protected, we would be the first to protect it, on this side of the aisle.

What is not acceptable at school board meetings or any other place are direct threats made by people directed at school personnel, school officials, teachers, or anyone else in our citizenry, our democracy, and our community.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the question was simple. It is on the issue of the memoranda, whether or not my colleague agreed that the FBI should treat parents as domestic terrorists.

The letter has not been rescinded. It is still in place, and the actions of the Attorney General and the DOJ are irrefutable. Again, I point to the fact that that letter has still not been rescinded.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST) to elaborate more on this matter.

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, Scriptures tell us: “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God.”

As Police Week comes to a close, it is important that we continue to thank our law enforcement officers that protect our communities and tackle the huge recruiting and retention issues that our police departments are seeing.

At a time when violent crime is at an all-time high, and our police departments are understaffed and overworked

because of the impact of the defund the police movement and antipolice rhetoric, it is more important than ever that we support our law enforcement officers.

Former President Ronald Reagan once said: "There can be no more noble vocation than the protection of one's fellow citizens. . . . No single group is more fully committed to the well-being of their fellow Americans and to the faithful discharge of duty than our law enforcement." Law enforcement, we know, lives by creed. That creed is to serve and to protect.

Sheriff Rutherford's bill, H.R. 7809, would help law enforcement accomplish that mission. It would put law enforcement back into our communities and take criminals off the streets by allowing Federal grant dollars to offer a \$5,000 hiring and retention bonus to law enforcement officers.

I am grateful for the men and women of law enforcement and for their service, and I will continue to work with these heroes to see that our communities are safe places to live, to worship, and to raise a family.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I think the bill which the gentleman references was just introduced. We haven't had a markup or discussion, but I do note he should read his own bill. It says "up to \$5,000," which can be anywhere from \$1,000 to \$5,000, so I think he misunderstood the bill that he has introduced.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS), my good friend.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider H.R. 7809, the Communities Deserve Cops Act, to get police back on the force and criminals off our streets.

Police departments across the country are struggling to hire and retain new recruits to keep up with the pace of retirements and resignations.

Officer morale has been decimated by antipolice rhetoric coming from politicians and procrime policies that tie the hands of our police, like the disastrous bail law of my State where a perp arrested in the morning gets out of jail before the police officer even finishes his shift.

Crime in America's cities is skyrocketing. It is skyrocketing as a result of these policies.

An increase in ambush-style attacks against our police has put our officers in harm's way both on and off duty. In 2021, America saw the most law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty since 1995.

An NYPD officer puts their life on the line for \$46,000 a year. My hometown department, the NYPD, has seen more than 5,700 retirements over the last 3 years because politicians have made it impossible for them to do their job.

Nationally, retirements are up 45 percent, and resignations are up 18 percent, creating a dangerous situation in cities like mine that finished 2021 with the highest homicide rate in a decade.

The Communities Deserve Cops Act would allow law enforcement agencies to use Federal grant dollars to offer hiring and retention bonuses to our police officers. It would increase resources for our police at a time when too many politicians, including those in this Chamber, are looking to strip away resources.

It is unfortunate that legislation like this even needs to be considered. The endemic problems surrounding our police are a direct result of a systematic targeting of those who protect us by progressive politicians.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, earlier this Congress, I offered a resolution condemning calls to defund, abolish, or dismantle our police, and guess what? Every one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against it. This is the problem.

When our police departments are understaffed and overworked, Congress must step up to provide them with the tools they need to effectively do their job.

In this year's Federal budget, I fought to get millions of dollars for the NYPD's K9 unit, forensic equipment, and protective gear.

I urge my colleagues to support this critically important piece of legislation to give our brave men and women in blue the respect and the support they need to do their jobs and keep our communities safe.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I suggest to the gentlewoman that she support this bill, which provides training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in understanding, detecting, deterring, and investigating acts of domestic terrorism, as we saw demonstrated just this past weekend in our State, a State that she and I both live in, in Buffalo, New York, where members of the Buffalo Police Department faced great danger.

These are the kind of resources we want to give, the kind of resources embodied in this bill, the kind of resources that the bill envisioned 2 years ago when Members of this House by voice vote approved this bill.

We want and welcome their support for this bill. Let's get at it, and let's make sure that we are really helping law enforcement at the local level, at the State level, and at the Federal level deal with the emerging threats of domestic violence and domestic terrorism.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gen-

tlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), my good friend and fellow appropriator.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge defeat of the previous question so we can protect and support local police departments to help them hire and retain more officers. It is that simple.

Over the past year we have seen a dramatic rise in crime in communities across our Nation. And the district I serve, my home in southwest Washington, hasn't been spared. Not a day goes by without a local paper depicting another carjacking, killing, burglary, or assault. These are on the rise.

When you meet with our local law enforcement, as I have, they have been sounding the alarm for well more than a year. Then consider the phrase that we have all heard repeated by politicians across this country and in this town: Defund the police.

In States like mine, Washington, so-called police reform laws have made it harder for police to catch criminals and do their jobs. Place yourself in the shoes of a law enforcement officer who puts her life on the line every single day. It is no wonder that honorable individuals have left the profession in droves.

One county sheriff's department in my region announced that deputies would no longer be able to respond to certain crimes like theft of property, stolen vehicles, and more, due to the laws that are trying to defund police. This is deeply concerning. We must act now to help shore up our police forces to keep our cities and streets safe.

The Communities Deserve Cops Act will help reverse staffing shortages by providing and signing retention bonuses for police officers. It is time to stop chasing individuals away from the profession of policing, which is exactly what we have been doing, and the Communities Deserve Cops Act will help bring folks back into law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question so the House can bring up this legislation to improve it, to help hire and retain police officers, to shore up our police departments, and help keep our communities safe.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I don't want to belabor what I have said repeatedly. What we saw last week and what we continue to see around the country as it relates to domestic terrorism deserves and demands our attention, and the seriousness with which the American people have trusted us, the responsibility of finding solutions to these problems.

I appreciate my colleagues may not support that. They may not want to stand with us as we try to fight domestic terrorism and the rise of white supremacy. They may not want to address members of the Black community in Buffalo being targeted, and members of the Black community in Rochester being targeted, and people around the country being targeted.

But to continue to avoid the question and create misdirection, I think people

tuning in would have a hard time understanding what it is we are doing. Let's be clear. We are trying to address, in the most serious way we possibly can, the rise of domestic terrorism. We are asking for support for our Federal agencies to get them better coordinated. We are asking for more resources for State and local law enforcement agencies to confront these challenges.

If you don't want to stand with us; that is okay. If you want to go back and tell people back home why you don't think domestic terrorism—which rises—demands the attention of the Congress; that is okay. But continuing to come and try to create misdirection, and to continue to try to confuse people about what is going on is a disservice to the millions of Americans who give us the awesome responsibility of watching out for their communities and their families.

Let's just be clear about what we are doing today and what the choices are and what the vote is and what the bill is before the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would just note, my colleagues are talking about what we are actually here to talk about. We are talking about the concern about Black Americans. How about the fact that in Chicago we had 800 homicides last year. How about in Philadelphia, 562 homicides. How about in D.C., 227 homicides. How about in Austin, we had 89 homicides. The 12 major cities that broke homicide records in 2021 all have Democratic mayors.

Now, Democrats on the other side of the aisle want to politicize what should be a bipartisan approach to figure out how to combat crime, the very crime that has been created by the policies of our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle. That is the truth and that is what we know.

The gentleman from New York is talking about what is going on with respect to domestic terrorism. The fact of the matter is, we know the truth. He asked what is different? Well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania answered what is different. We know precisely what is different, which is that this Department of Justice is targeting Americans, like Scott Smith, a father in Loudon County, Virginia, who dared to go to the school board and complain about the assault of his daughter in a public school.

Now, the gentleman from New York is smirking—smirking about a little girl who was raped in a high school. The father goes to complain to the school board, and then the National School Boards Association coordinates with the Department of Justice to figure out how to target parents; to then

tag individuals specifically as to whether or not they are threatening people by merely going to a school board to register their complaint.

That is what is at stake here. That is why we are opposing what Democrats are trying to do. Then they want to gloss over things like Frank James in Brooklyn, a Black nationalist who goes in and assaults 30 to 33 people on a subway in New York. That just gets wistfully wiped away while the gentleman wants to politicize that which we should be coming together to figure out how to save the American people from the harm befalling them.

That is what is going on with the rule here. I will talk about energy later. The rule here is bad for the United States of America, and we should be protecting the people here during cop week.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I find it incredibly insulting that anyone would suggest that I would smirk about the rape of a 10-year-old girl. I find it disgusting. I find the gentleman should offer an apology.

This is a serious matter. That is why we are here. We have solemn obligations. We should take them seriously. No ranting is necessary. No accusations. And certainly not insults being thrown about on the floor of the House of Representatives. I am incredibly dismayed that the gentleman would say anything even remotely like that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, for over 3 years, House Democrats have pushed for a radical, far left agenda that does absolutely nothing to address the serious issues facing American families. The legislation made in order under today's rule is no exception to that.

H.R. 350 adds bureaucracy and adds red tape to existing law enforcement resources, while completely ignoring new and evolving terrorist threats.

H.R. 7688, this is the Democrats' socialist energy price-fixing scheme that will actually lead to less energy production and further exacerbate American families' pain at the pump.

Finally, H.R. 7790, does nothing—I repeat, nothing—to put more formula on store shelves or hold Biden's FDA accountable for ignoring this crisis despite knowing about it for the last year.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve more than empty promises and meaningless legislation, they deserve action.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for their words in support of

the rule before us today. As I mentioned earlier, we have before us relatively simple measures that take action to both support working families and protect our communities from domestic terrorism and violent extremism.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle can attempt to misdirect and confuse and make accusations and hurl insults all they want, but the reality is we are presenting concrete proposals to address issues facing our Nation that should be noncontroversial.

The Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act will allow law enforcement to better deter acts of domestic terrorism.

The Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act will ensure that Big Oil cannot record historic profits at the expense of everyday Americans.

The Infant Formula Supplemental Appropriations Act will help provide much needed relief for parents struggling to find formula for their children.

I look forward to supporting all three bills on the floor. I appreciate my colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1124

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7809) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for law enforcement officer bonuses. 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; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7809.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam 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 on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

The motion to recommit on H.R. 6531;